DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 983 HE 011 880

AUTHOR Stanton, L. Patrick
TITLE A Record of the Processes Leading to Faculty Collective Bargaining at Chicago State University.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 90p.; Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; College Faculty; Educational History; Employer Employee Relationship; Governing Boards; *Grievance Procedures; Higher Education; *Negotiation Agreements; *State Universities; *Teacher Strikes; Unions
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago State University IL; Illinois

ABSTRACT

An objective record is presented of the processes that led to faculty collective bargaining at Chicago State University (CSU), based principally on the published proceedings of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois. The study presents chronologically the official record of the CSU faculty-governing board relationship from April 1965, when a governance transfer of Chicago Teachers College from the City of Chicago to the State of Illinois was announced, to October 1976, when the American Federation of Teachers was elected agent for the faculty of CSU and its four sister board-governed state universities. The account of the early years leads to April 1968 and probably the nation's first strike at a four-year institution over collective bargaining. The chronology of the years following supplies a record of the events that led the Board to enter into faculty collective bargaining without enabling legislation, a first in Illinois and apparently the nation. (Author/PHR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED177983

# A RECORD OF THE PROCESSES LEADING TO FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AT CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY

EDUCATIONAL POLICY SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

L. Patrick Stanton, M. A.

Chicago State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Patrick Stanton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DR. GEORGE GRIMES

CHICAGO III

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

MARCH, 1977

HE 011 880

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Abstract | 1 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Background and Significance | 5 |
| Procedures | 9 |
| The Chronological Study | 14 |
| An Historic Preamble | 14 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1965 | 16 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1966 | 17 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1967 | 19 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1968 | 20 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1969 | 30 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1970 | 32 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1971 | 33 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1972 | 35 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1973 | 36 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1974 | 40 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1975 | 46 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1976 | 58 |
| Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1977 | 69 |
| An Ancillary Study to the Chronological Study | 72 |
| Conclusion | 75 |
| References | 85 |

## ABSTRACT

This practicum is an objective record of the processes which led to faculty collective bargaining at Chicago State University, based principally on the published Proceedings of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois. The study presents chronologically the official record of the CSU faculty-governing board relationship from April 1965, when a governance transfer of Chicago Teachers College from the City of Chicago to the State of Illinois was announced, to October 1976, when the AFT was elected agent for the faculty of CSU and its four sister BOG-governed state universities. Items in the study were selected from over 6,000 pages of published Proceedings for their relationship either to collective bargaining itself or to expressed faculty dissatisfaction with Board policies. Other sources were used only if the Board minutes left key elements incomplete. The practicum successfully fulfills its primary objective of giving key administrators, recent to CSU, a necessary historical perspective of this new issue of faculty collective bargaining. Secondarily, it provides the student of collective bargaining a history of CSU's pivotal role in two landmark events. The account of the early years leads to April 1968 and probably the nation's first strike at a four year institution over collective bargaining. The chronology of the years following supplies the record of the events which led the Board to enter into faculty collective bargaining with CSU and its sister schools on a voluntary basis without enabling legislation, a first in Illinois and apparently in the nation.

## INTRODUCTION

In an election held on October 20 and 21, 1976, the faculty of Chicago State University (CSU), together with the faculty of Chicago State's four sister institutions, Eastern Illinois University, Governors State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and Western Illinois University, voted for the AFT Federation-BOG of the American Federation of Teachers union as their collective bargaining agent to represent them in negotiations on a system-wide basis with the universities' governing body, the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois. This election of a collective bargaining agent was the first for CSU and its sister schools and was also the first such election for any of Illinois' state universities. This practicum is an objective record of the processes which led to a collective bargaining election at CSU principally based on an examination of the published Proceedings of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois.

Encouragement in the compilation of this record came from key administrators at CSU who agreed that better understanding of the processes which brought about this unique situation would be very desirable in dealing with this new issue effectively and with insight. Communications between the union and the Board of Governors began in 1967, long before the arrival on campus of the current president or academic vice president. Benjamin H. Alexander, the president of CSU, joined CSU in July 1974, with most of his prior experience as a federal administrator in Washington with the National Institutes of Health and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Allan De Giulio, the academic vice president, came to CSU in September 1975 from the New York State Board of Education in Albany.

In a memo to the writer, the president of the University reiterated his earlier comments when told of the proposed practicum:

> I look forward to the completion of your practicum. To deal wisely with this significant new issue for CSU, both Dr. De Giulio and I need such an objective history (Alexander, 1977).

A third administrator, the vice president for administrative affairs, Arthur Elbert, who is also CSU's official bargaining representative, concurred in another memo (Elbert, 1977):

> As I told you some months ago, I encourage you to prepare your proposed practicum documenting the recorded processes which led to collective bargaining. I know I will find it helpful, and although your emphasis will be on CSU, I expect that it will be enlightening for my counterparts from the other institutions as well.
>
> Furthermore, your study could have value beyond the State of Illinois because it is my understanding that this collective bargaining agreement is the first in the country in which a public system has entered into collective bargaining voluntarily without enabling legislation.

Dr. Elbert offered one clear caution, probably because of his great sensitivity to the issue:

> I would urge you to confine yourself as much as possible to the recorded material in the official BOG minutes with elaboration from other sources only when necessary. At this stage an objective account is essential to offset the hearsay which invariably accompanies a new issue.

Following Dr. Elbert's advice, the study turns to other documents only when the Board of Governors (BOG) minutes are not sufficiently clear in themselves to inform the reader. Ancillary documents utilized include the minutes of the meetings of the Council of Faculties and the Report of the Council of Faculties to the Board, the Reports of the Council of Presidents to the Board, and the Reports of the Legal Counsel to the Board. Each of these documents is available to the public but not to the same extent as are the annual printed Proceedings.

Only in those few instances where official documentation was incomplete and the matter extremely important were the campus newspaper, Tempo, and the metropolitan newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, utilized to provide pertinent information. And in two instances where historical background would be enlightening, reference is made to two texts on the subject of collective bargaining.

The format is a chronological history based on a reading of the printed Proceedings since Fiscal Year 1965 and on a selection of recorded items which could have had an effect on the outcome. Following the history is a brief analysis of the findings, in which CSU's route to collective bargaining is related to national patterns and CSU's role in bringing about the Board decision is discussed.

## BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

This topic was chosen as the practicum in the Educational Policy Systems module of Nova University's National Ed.D. program because of the emphasis given the topic of collective bargaining in the module itself, because of its immediate relevancy on the campus of Chicago State University, and because of the growing importance of collective bargaining in forming higher educational policy throughout the nation.

That the subject of collective bargaining relates well to the Educational Policy module is clear from an examination of the module content. The Nova guide for the module includes the topic "Faculty Organization" as one of the nine issues addressed in the guide. Two of the three reading references for that topic are on collective bargaining. The instructor's own textbook, The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education (Blocker, Bender, & Martorama, 1975), makes reference to collective bargaining of faculty unions in five of the eight chapters, and the authors include collective bargaining in their conclusion as a "Critical Issue" (p. 205) facing higher education.

At the time the Educational Policy System module began, in October 1976, faculty collective bargaining was a major issue on the CSU campus and has continued to be so. At that time, the election of an agent was just a few weeks hence. It was generally agreed that collective bargaining might have a dramatic impact on all the policies of the University. Conversation ensued as to both the how and the why it had come about. However, most speculation was based on events taking place at the Board of Governors meetings during the past year or so when the issue became preeminent, but the history of the issue prior to recent years seemed to be based on conflicting recollections.

In their book Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus, Carr and Van Eyck (1973) offered in the preface as the justification for the book: "An undeniable need exists for an orderly and generally dispassionate account of what has been happening regarding collective bargaining on campuses" (1973, p. ix). The time seemed ripe for such an "orderly and dispassionate account" of the coming of collective bargaining to the campus of Chicago State, and the key administrators as quoted above agreed.

The importance of the subject in higher education is apparent from the the extent to which faculty collective bargaining has become a phenomenon in recent years. Kemerer and Baldridge's study (1975) traced that phenomenon. In 1966 eleven campuses had faculty bargaining agents. By 1970 this had reached 160. Their charts show that by mid-1975 nearly one-seventh,430, of the 3,038 colleges and universities had faculty bargaining agents.

Two other recent studies confirm the great increase although total figures vary, probably because of a different interpretation of campus and/or institution. The Ladd-Lipset Survey (1976) stated that bargaining agents had been chosen to represent faculties of 294 institutions "with over 410 campuses" (p. 11), while Means and Semas (1976) in their Handbook cite "419 campuses" (p. 45).

The most recent national compilation was made in May 1976 (Semas, 1976) and claims that 60 additional campuses voted for union representation during the 1975-76 academic year, bringing the total according to this study to 461. Through the first half of the 76-77 academic year, the increase was proportionally small. Of the eight new four-year colleges on the list, five of course are Illinois' BOG institutions including CSU. Only four additional two-year colleges voted for an agent. However, one of the four was the 4,000 member Los Angeles Community College District (Faculty Unionization, 1977), which undoubtedly, when interpreted at the end of the year, will add many

more to the campus total.

Concurrent with the rapidly increasing number of campuses with faculty collective bargaining has been a growing disposition on the part of faculty to accept collective bargaining as appropriate in higher education. In 1969 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reported that nearly three-fifths of all academics endorsed the principle of bargaining by rejecting the proposition that "collective bargaining by faculty has no place in a college or university" (Trow, 1977), or as Carr and Van Eyck interpreted that study: "Fifty-nine per cent of the 60,000 respondents strongly agreed or agreed with reservations that faculty collective bargaining has (a) place in American higher education" (1973, p.40). Ladd & Lipset in their 1975 study (1976) found that this figure had risen to 69%, while Trow (1977) in his 1975 study for the Carnegie Commission placed the pro-collective bargaining faculty at 72% of the total.

Not only is the sentiment growing but so too is the actual unionization. Well over 100,000 faculty are now estimated to be unionized out of the more than 600,000 total faculty in the U.S. (Semas, 1976).

Both the growth in the expressed interest nationally on the part of faculty and the clear trend toward bargaining then should confirm the desirability of studies on the subject such as this one on CSU. The significance of the study beyond the campus of Chicago State can only be presumed. That the event, however, marks a first in Illinois is beyond question.

CSU and its four sister institutions are the first four-year schools in Illinois permitting faculty collective bargaining, although faculty at twenty of the state's two-year colleges are unionized (Means and Semas, 1976). Illinois has no legislation applying to collective bargaining in higher education, so in each case the governing board has voluntarily agreed to

collective bargaining. The Board of Governors decision for its five-school system was voluntary, as a result of a vote of the Board members. Because the two-year colleges in Illinois are related to specific community taxing districts, they have revenue potential beyond just the state appropriations; the BOG institutions receive all their revenue from the state.

The history of the event may also be of interest beyond the boundaries of Illinois, as Dr. Elbert indicated in his memo quoted above. The Board of Governors' voluntary decision to engage in collective bargaining on a system-wide basis without enabling legislation appears to be the first in the nation for a four-year institution system.

Of the 115 four-year public institutions with faculty unions recorded through December 31, 1975, only six are in states without legislation, and each of the six are individual institutions with individual agreements, not system-wide (Means and Semas, 1976).

Collective bargaining elections as reported regularly in the Chronicle of Higher Education since that date have been either systems with enabling legislation such as the State of Florida or individual elections such as those at Eastern Oregon College and the University of Oregon.

The study then would seem to have significance from Chicago State's own perspective and could also be of interest to those in higher education in Illinois and to students of faculty unionization nationally.

## PROCEDURES

For an "orderly and dispassionate account" and to confine the study to the " recorded material" as recommended by CSU vice president Elbert, the basic source of this history was the printed minutes, or proceedings, of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois, the governing board since 1965 for CSU.

Each year the recorded and approved minutes of the Board are reprinted in bound versions running chronologically from the first meeting of each fiscal year in July to the following June meeting which concluded the year. Customarily the Board meets once a month excepting August and December.

A thorough reading was made of the last twelve volumes commencing with the Proceedings of the Teachers College Board, the predecessor board to the BOG, for Fiscal Year 1965 and continuing through the as yet unbound minutes of the November 1976 Board meeting, at which time the results were in for the October 20-21 collective bargaining agent election. If bound in one volume, the combined proceedings would total over 6,000 pages.

Initially items which seemed pertinent to the subject matter were selected from 395 pages and were either transferred to3x5 cards, or, where the comment or dialogue was extensive, photocopied. The progressively greater attention to the subject was apparent from a count of the number of relevant items each year. During the first five years, Fiscal Year 1965 (FY65) to Fiscal Year 1969 (FY69), 102 items were collected. In the next five years, FY70 to FY74, 152 items were collected. During the recent two and a half years, FY75, FY76, and four meetings of FY77, 111 items seemed worthy of noting.

Each item was selected based on either or both of two criteria: Does it relate to collective bargaining itself? Or does it relate to expressed CSU-related faculty dissatisfaction with Board policies or procedures? Because this practicum is limited to describing only CSU's path to collective

bargaining, full analysis was not made of matters concerning the other three or four BOG institutions (the number varying during the 12 years); however, in some cases where an issue had system-wide relevance, items on the other schools were included. Because, as the issue developed, it became a system matter rather than just a concern of CSU faculty, the majority of the entries in recent years concern all five institutions as a whole.

The items were arranged in chronological order, and about one-third were discarded as not being essential to the continuity. Each year's items are covered separately under the heading "Proceedings for Fiscal Year ___." Through Fiscal Year 1973, because items were relatively few with many of the monthly meetings having no significance to the issue, a summary of the recorded events for the year is presented. From the beginning of FY74 to November 1976 each meeting is recorded individually under a sub-heading giving the month, date, and year of the meeting. A strict chronological format is maintained from FY74 on. With the issue from then on becoming a major one, to continue to summarize would destroy the continuity for the reader.

Generally in the interest of clarity and space, the information recorded here for an entry was reduced to cover the substance of the material in the minutes. The method of recording required in formal minutes such as the Board's generates much verbiage not essential for this study. In addition, the propensity of the Secretaries of the Board in recent years to record almost verbatim the comments of the Board members made succinct summarization essential. Nonetheless, when imperative for full understanding or when an item was brief, direct quotations were used.

Sources other than the Board minutes were used very sparingly and only if the Board record left key questions unanswered. For example, a major

event of the entire history was the faculty strike over collective bargaining in April 1968. The minutes for the April 18, 1968 meeting included only this notation:

> Mr. Nelson reported to the Board on the matter of the 'striking' teachers at the two Chicago colleges. It was reported that the strikers had returned to their positions as of 10:00 a.m. on the day of this Board meeting, April 18, 1968 (Proceedings, FY68, p. 389).

No further reference to the strike itself was made. Therefore, for a matter of such great consequence to the study, outside sources were essential, in this case the college newspaper and the Chicago Tribune.

Other sources used for occasional clarification were the Reports of the Legal Officer, the minutes of the meetings of the Council of Faculties, the Reports of the Council of Faculties to the Board, and the Reports of the Council of Presidents to the Board. These data are not published as such but are filed as received with the Board and with the institutions.

One limitation to having information on the total process came from the Board's practice of holding "Executive Sessions," usually the evening before the open meeting, at which time personnel matters are to be discussed, and where, as the minutes attest, many policy matters are discussed and settled prior to the open session. Only the minutes of the public meeting are recorded by the Board Secretary.

Another limitation to obtaining total understanding of the process, commented on above, is the manner in which the various Executive Officers, who are the Recording Secretaries, chose to record the proceedings. In the earlier years, when Dr. McKelvey was executive officer, the minutes were

overly succinct, often including no more than the motions passed with little or no record of the accompanying discussion. Apparently at the wishes of the Board members, the note-taking became progressively more voluminous until under Dr. Walters, the current executive officer, verbatim records are the rule rather than the exception, a style which makes summarization here very necessary.

Another limitation comes from the fact that frequently items are presented by title alone, such as "Item VI. Collective Bargaining." While discussion of the item may be recorded thoroughly, the content of the item itself is not recorded in the minutes but must be inferred from the discussion.

An inherent limitation comes, of course, from confining the study to CSU-related events, a decision based on the desire to make it of primary value to Chicago State administrators. Information on events taking place on the other campuses, and in particular that of Western Illinois, concerning agitation for collective bargaining, may have added to a better understanding of the total movement of the Board toward bargaining. However, inclusion even of selective items from the other four campuses would have shifted the emphasis from CSU.

At the time of the original practicum proposal, one segment of the history was to be the inclusion of some correspondence and/or interviews with persons active at CSU during the years under study. From informal conversations on the subject with campus individuals, it soon became apparent that introducing personal recollections, many of them likely to be uncomplimentary to persons involved in the process, would be at cross-purposes to the principal aim of an objective record. This addendum was dropped.

Added to the originally proposed format was an analysis of the Reports of the Legal Officer to the Board. This appears at the end of the History and was included as a means of underscoring the disproportionate extent to which the Chicago State faculty with the union were in adversarial relationships with Board.

The manuscript was prepared according to guidelines proscribed in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA, 1974). However, in the History itself, reference citations are purposely kept to a minimum inasmuch as the entire account came principally from one source, the Board's annual Proceedings, and the chronological format is a guide to the reader in itself. The page number references in the History are always to the annual bound copy of the Proceedings for the year under which the reference falls in the study.

## THE CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY

### An Historic Preamble

Before beginning the chronological study presentation, the reader would best gain an insight into the current status of Chicago State University against an historical perspective. The primary source for the material in the preamble is a printed piece from CSU's Office of University Relations called Profile of the University (Stanton, 1976).

Chicago State University is a state-supported four year institution of higher education on the Far South Side of Chicago, Illinois. A commuter school, it primarily serves students from the Chicago Metropolitan Area. It is located on a four-year old 155-acre campus, having moved in 1972 from its 103-year old location on the mid-south side of Chicago.

The University currently enrolls almost 7,000 students, approximately two-thirds undergraduate and one-third graduate students. The graduate students are almost all part-time with the overwhelming majority employed in elementary and secondary education. Graduate degrees are the Master of Arts, Master of Science, and the Master of Science in Education.

Four colleges make up the University -- Arts and Science, Business and Administration, Education, and Nursing. The combined curricula include 28 undergraduate and 12 graduate degree programs.

Full-time teaching faculty number 280; part-time average about 100 a term. There are 85 administrators, 34 of whom have faculty rank. Of all those with faculty rank, 178 hold the doctorate. The University also has a civil service staff of about 300.

The institution was founded in 1869 as the Cook County Normal School

to prepare teachers for the county's elementary schools. During the balance of the 19th century, the institution grew in enrollment and influence, gradually winning an international reputation for its innovative and progressive methods in preparing teachers.

In 1897 control of the institution was transferred from the Cook County Board of Commissioners to the Chicago Board of Education. Under the jurisdiction of the City of Chicago, the institution, now called Chicago Normal School, shifted its direction from innovation and experimentation toward traditional curricula, low-cost in-service training programs for the city's teachers, and curriculum planning for the city's public schools. In 1938, implementing the recommendation of a Columbia University study team, the institution became a four-year teachers college, Chicago Teachers College, and established a four year program leading to a Bachelor of Education degree.

In 1961 a Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of Illinois was commissioned and in 1965 was submitted to the Illinois General Assembly. The Master Plan, which set forth long-term objectives for the state's system of higher education, included a discussion of the Teachers College as a state institution of higher education with a broad multi-purpose role.

By 1965 when the study here begins, the institution had become two campuses, Chicago Teachers College (South) and Chicago Teachers College (North), both headed by a dean and under the supervision of the superintendent of schools of the city of Chicago. CTC (South), the original institution at 68th and Stewart Avenue, eventually became Chicago State University and will receive the major focus of this study. CTC (North), on a new campus on the North Side of Chicago, came about as a merger of a number of branches

of the original college , which were scattered throughout the city. CTC (North) eventually became Northeastern Illinois University.

As the chronology opens, the decision had been made to bring the two colleges under the total aegis of the State of Illinois. Kearney (1969) in the University's centennial publication tells of speculation and various plans regarding state-funding of the college being presented continually from 1948 on. By 1965 the State had assumed 100% of the funding for the college, and a decision was made and proposed to the legislature that the college pass to control of the State and fall for its governance under the then-existing Teachers College Board of Illinois.

That board in Fiscal Year 1965 was the governing body of four state institutions, Northern Illinois University, Illinois State University, Eastern Illinois University, and Western Illinois University. All of these were located in downstate Illinois, that is, outside metropolitan Chicago. All four were former state-supported teachers colleges, which had evolved first into multi-purpose colleges after World War II and finally into universities.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1965

The first reference in the Teachers College Board Proceedings to the then Chicago Teachers College (CTC) occurred in April 1965. The likelihood of the state acquiring Chicago Teachers College and designating the Teachers College Board as its governing board was noted. A resolution was passed in which the Board stated its intent "to protect the salary scales, tenure rights, and retirement benefits" then current for the CTC employees "provided they were in accordance with law and presently existing customs

and practices" (p. 525).

Apparently the proposed addition of CTC to the Teachers College Board Governance had raised the issue in Springfield of reducing the extent of the Board's governance. At the May meeting a resolution was passed opposing a Senate bill which would set up a separate board for Northern Illinois University, the largest and probably the most prestigious of the Board's institutions. The Board endorsed the continuation of the three current state governing boards, one for the University of Illinois and its three campuses at Champaign, Chicago Circle, and Chicago Medical Center, one for Southern Illinois University and its two campuses, and the Teachers College Board for the remainder.

Guests at both the May and June 1965 meetings were the Deans of CTC (South) and (North), Raymond M. Cook and Jerome M. Sachs. A committee was appointed in June to consider the organization of the Teachers College and to locate a site or sites for the College. All early Board references were to the College in the singular as one institution with two campuses.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1966

Chicago Teachers College (North) and (South), under its new name of Illinois Teachers College-Chicago, was officially welcomed to the Board at the July 19, 1965 meeting as a result of bills passed and signed by Governor Kerner. The Board's name had also been changed in concurrent legislation to "Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities." The four current member institutions were the "Universities" in the title and the latest acquisition the "State College." McKelvey, the Board's

executive officer, was appointed acting president of Illinois Teachers College-Chicago (ITC-C) to "enable the Board and its staff to study administrative plans" and give the two-campus institution "a single administrative head" (p. 44).

Most of the proceedings of FY66 implied a good faculty-Board relationship, although a few items were harbingers of future problems.

A July motion to permit faculty to choose between nine or twelve month pay periods was followed by a notation in October of a letter from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) "expressing their appreciation" (p. 245). The deans of both campuses in August told of their faculty's pleasure over meetings held between McKelvey and the ITC-C faculty groups. By October the faculty senates on both Chicago campuses were said to be elected and organized with ad hoc committees from both campuses working together.

However, a potential problem rose in August on salaries. Special approval was required of previously recommended salaries at ITC-C for the upcoming academic year because the "salary maximum under the Chicago Board of Education schedule will exceed the maximum of the Board of Governors" (p. 118).

On December 21, 1965 ITC-South was shaken by the unexpected death of Raymond Cook, its dean who had served as the college head for 18 years. Dr. John M. Beck was appointed acting dean, but a search committee bypassed him and in June the Board selected Milton B. Byrd, then academic vice president at Northern Michigan University, as president of ITC-C(South). In the case of ITC-C(North),Dean Sachs was appointed president in February.

Then in the May 16, 1966 meeting report came the first reference in a

Board report to a faculty union. The Board disapproved a request from the Cook County College Teachers Union for dues check-off for its members at ITC-C (North) and (South). The Policy Committee of the Board which recommended disapproval gave the reason that a great number of professional organizations would be equally eligible.

Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1967

Fiscal Year 1967 was relatively uneventful from the perspective of this study. Only four events in the minutes seem of consequence.

In November the Board reconsidered and rescinded the action it took in May 1966 and approved dues check-off for the Cook County College Teachers Union "according to the provisions of the State Salary and Withholding Act" (p. 345).

With the presidents already named, the Board asked for legislation in August 1966 to give each of the two Chicago campuses its own legal identity as Chicago State College for South and Northeastern Illinois State College for North. This was later legislated effective July 1, 1967.

The Board's jurisdiction would then have been over six state institutions. However, in March 1967 the Board was told it would soon lose control over its two largest schools, Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University, and that as of July 1, 1967 a new Board of Regents would be created to govern those two.

In February the first reference to a suit against the Board by a faculty member from any of the Board institutions was alluded to when a new maternity leave policy was offered for consideration. The Board attorney

was directed to notify Mrs. Dorothy Dierickx, ITC-C (South) faculty member, and her attorney of the action. Mrs. Dierickx's suit was reported settled in the Report of the Legal Officer in June 1967 with the adoption of a new maternity leave policy and the awarding to her of pay for the winter term.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1968

Fiscal Year 1968 marked a year of major confrontation between the Board and the Cook County College Teachers Union or AFT Local 1600. The union attempted what turned out to be a premature show of strength regarding collective bargaining. The Board's victory in this confrontation caused the issue of collective bargaining to fade from prominence for several more years.

One can only speculate on the cause of the union's decision to move on the Board that year, but probably a major stimulus was the success, described by Kemerer and Baldridge (1975), in the same union's negotiations with the City Colleges of Chicago on behalf of their faculty. In 1966, without a state collective bargaining statute, the Chicago City College administration recognized the CCTU as the exclusive representative of the teaching faculty on the seven junior college campuses. As the authors commented, "this contract demonstrated how tough a faculty union could be" (p. 33). Course load was reduced to no more than 13 contact hours a week. Salaries were increased an average of $500, a three year tenure policy was accepted, and $300 in fringe benefits was added. The union members at CSC and NISC no doubt were very aware of the union's success in the City Colleges.

The year began with the first involvement of the union with the Board as a result of the rejection by the Board on July 17, 1967 of the appointment of Dr. Staughton Lynd as associate professor of history at CSC. The Lynd case generated national attention and was not settled until the October 19 meeting when the Board reversed itself.

Because the case marked a victory for the union in its first dealing with the Board, which may have encouraged them to go all the way six months later, and because it was a cause celebre in itself, it is described at length here.

Lynd had been recommended by President Byrd and the faculty for an appointment to commence September 1, 1967. The Board rejection, based on their right to approve or reject all appointments, was a 5 to 1 vote and was accompanied by a Board statement. The statement acknowledged the Board's "ultimate responsibility for employment" and "did not question Dr. Lynd's ability as a scholar and teacher of history" but declared that "his public activism which included a visit to North Viet Nam and China without a valid passport, and his statement that 'deliberate law breaking through non-violent civil disobedience is a valid, and should become a routine form of democratic dialogue' goes beyond mere dissent" (p. 4).

The Board further stated that it did not "deny Dr. Lynd's right to dissent on any issue, nor his freedom to speak and support the causes he espouses (but) believes a teacher has a responsibility to support and stay within the laws of this country" (p. 5).

The lone dissenter was the Board chairman, Richard Nelson, then an Inland Steel executive, who several years later became president of Northern Illinois University.

Lynd's background was not detailed further in the Board's proceedings, but a Chicago Tribune editorial ("We Are Spared," 1967), lauding the Board's rejection of Lynd, referred to Lynd's involvement with the freedom schools in Mississippi, the student march in 1965 on Washington, and the campus disorders at Berkeley. Casey Banas (1967) in a news report in the Tribune of that same day, July 18, 1967, stated that Lynd was on a leave of absence from Yale and had been rejected by the administrations of both University of Illinois-Circle and Northern Illinois University, despite faculty recommendations he be hired at each.

At the September Board meeting, the Lynd case was still very alive with reports of appearances on Lynd's behalf at the executive session of representatives of the Committee for Academic Freedom in Illinois, the AAUP, and the Cook County College Teachers Union, in the last instance in the person of Henry Patin, education professor at CSC.

That the union had sued the Board for Lynd's claim was clear from the October meeting report. After the normal business matters the October 16 meeting was "voted into recess . . . to consider the case of Local 1600, AFT, et al v. Board of Governors" (p. 188), on October 19 in a closed session. The minutes then reported that after a half-hour closed session on October 19 the Board reconvened in an open session, wherein a unanimous vote was taken to reconsider Lynd's nomination and then accept it subject to the dismissal of all litigation regarding the appointment.

The Tribune provided more details. A headlined page one story ("O.K. Lynd," 1967) reported that a suit filed August 1 by Lynd claimed that the written commitments he had received from President Byrd constituted a legal contract. The Tribune described a "compromise" offered Lynd of a one-year contract "to work with graduate students engaged in research in history" (p. 4), a full year's salary, and moving expenses, in exchange for

his and the union's dropping the suit.

Coincidental with this union victory, the October meeting marked the first reference in the Board minutes to the subject of collective bargaining for faculty. Executive officer McKelvey noted that Mr. Norman Swenson, the president of the union, had requested permission to appear before the Board at the November meeting to present a proposed program and a request for collective bargaining for the faculty of the two Chicago colleges.

At the subsequent meeting on November 20, note was merely made of the previous night's appearance at the executive session of Norman Swenson, the union president, Professor Patin, chairman of the union's state college division, and Gilbert Cronfield, the union's legal counsel. Chairman Nelson said a response to the union's request for a bargaining election for the academic staffs of Chicago State and Northeastern would be made at the January meeting.

The union proposal is not described at all in the minutes, but the CSU student newspaper, Tempo, covered it fully in its November 30, 1967 issue ("Faculty fights," 1967). The proposal presented by Local 1600 carried 16 items, among which were a 36-week calendar, a salary range from $10,000 to $31,000, a class load of nine hours for undergraduate and six hours for graduate teaching, and the elimination of the requirement for the doctorate for promotion to associate and full professor. Tempo reported that the union had sent copies of "the Union Collective Bargaining Contract proposals" (p. 1) to the entire faculty, not just union members, at both CSC and NISC, asking them to vote on the proposals.

Results of that vote as reported to Tempo by the union were: At CSC, 173 or 69% of the total faculty of 218 voted with 157 voting in favor; at NISC, 140 or 63% of the total faculty of 222 voted with 118 voting Yes.

The minutes for the January 1968 meeting on the subject of the response to the union comprise four pages. The policy statement itself, which was not included in the minutes, consisted of 33 pages according to a later Tempo story ("CSC faculty strikes out," 1968). A Board motion following the policy statement supported the executive officer's recommendation and denied the request for the collective bargaining election.

McKelvey's comments in the January Board report enumerated the principal reasons for the rejection of the request. He pointed out that the union was in fact a junior college teachers union and that only the Merchant Marine Academy of all four year colleges had a collective bargaining contract. He said collective bargaining would cause academic freedom to suffer and would preclude merit salary increases. He referred to the "workable and wholesome" (p. 265) relationship of the Board's Joint Faculty Committees on Salary and Policy, which would be destroyed. He saw the weakening of faculty senates and faculty-board relations and forecast that only unions would have a voice with the Board.

He commented on Board benefits to the two colleges since the governance began 2½ years earlier, citing salary increases per faculty of $1,800, an increase in operating appropriations for the two colleges of from $5,400,00 in 64-65 to $13,100,000 in 67-68, and the appropriations for capital improvements of over $11 million for Northeastern and $48 million for Chicago State.

In his resolution he pointed out that "perhaps half" (p. 267) of the two college's faculty would not have a voice in such a collective bargaining arrangement and that half of the institutions governed by the Board would also have no voice in a contract agreement which applied just to Chicago

State and Northeastern and not to Western Illinois and Eastern Illinois.

The resolution as adopted committed the Board to continue faculty representation and governance in accordance with the AAUP, ACE, and Assn. of Governing Boards' statement of 1966.

Prior to the vote on the resolution, comments by visitors were permitted, which were summarized in the minutes. Swenson, the union president, called the resolution a "backward step" and a "paternalistic point of view"(p. 267). Patin urged a vote for the needs of the faculty. A Dr. Clark of AAUP's Northeastern chapter asked for a delay on a vote and suggested a four-institution faculty senate. Dr. C.M.Larson of the National AAUP staff in Washington also urged delay in responding to allow more discussion. He said AAUP did not oppose collective bargaining but preferred the alternative of stronger faculty involvment in governance.

An interesting sidelight of the same meeting was Board approval for the two Chicago colleges to look into the request of Local 1600 (the same union) to hold a bargaining election for the clerical employees of the two.

As pointed out in the introduction to this study, the fact that a substantial number of CSC (and NISC) faculty went out on strike is given relatively little mention in the Board minutes. Therefore, an abrupt departure from adherence to the Board minutes follows for the duration of the FY68 Report. Interspersed with the Board minutes' material is information gathered from Tempo and the Tribune. Without these two outside sources, the evolution and resolution of the strike would remain vague.

After the rejection of the union proposal by the Board in January, Tempo reported ("Election denial," 1968) that the union members had taken a secret ballot vote in which they endorsed 40 to 11 all the recommendations of the union's executive board that a strike vote be taken on February 6.

The strike vote itself, according to Tempo ("Faculty will strike," 1968), called for a work stoppage if the Board did not act upon the collective bargaining request by March 1. The vote at CSC for the strike threat was 71 in favor and 33 against; at NISC it was 46 for and 23 against. Those voting were said to represent 80% of the union members on the two campuses.

Swenson of the union is reported in Tempo to have written to the Board requesting a place on the agenda in order to present petitions signed by "over 75% of the faculties"("Board's denial," 1968, p. 1) requesting reconsideration on the election. Board chairman Nelson's reply is reported in the same story as saying he saw "no useful purpose" (p. 1) in Swenson's being on the agenda for the third consecutive meeting but that he would consider the petitions.

The Board minutes of March 21, 1968 acknowledged the receipt of these petitions, although Chairman Nelson's figures on the percentage of faculty represented differed from the union's figures in Tempo's account. Nelson referred to "approximately two-thirds of the CSC faculty and one-third of the NISC faculty" (p. 368) as having signed the petition rather than the 75% Swenson figure.

At the same Board meeting, reference was made to the appearance of Dr. Albert Forslev representing the "Faculty Association" (p.363) at Northeastern. He presented a petition from NISC faculty urging more effective communications with the Board and seeking an alternative to a labor union.

In the Board's rejection in January of collective bargaining, a number of references were made to the effectiveness of the Joint Faculty Committees of the Board. Nevertheless, the Board was clearly seeking an

alternative. At the March meeting a committee was approved to review and recommend to the Board the adoption of a new plan for faculty representation.

A strike did take place in April, although the Board minutes are very unspecific. But the Tribune and Tempo both confirm a faculty walk-out which lasted from April 3 to April 18. The latter date is that of the Board meeting in which Nelson is said to have reported to the Board "on the matter of the 'striking' teachers . . . who had returned to their positions as of 10 a.m. (today)" (p. 389).

Most of the account which appeared in the Tribune during the two week period consisted of conflicting statements by the union and the college presidents on the success of the strike. Initially in the Tribune on April 3 ("Teacher Vote," 1968) Swenson reported that the strike vote on the evening of April 2 was 2 to 1 in favor of the strike. The Tribune stated that the union claimed 228 members among the 440 teachers at the two colleges and 120 members had voted, which meant, as the AAUP chapter pointed out to the Tribune on April 5 ("Union To Keep Up," 1968), that only a small percentage of the faculty, about 17%, were represented by the pro-strike vote.

In the April 4 Tribune (Negrodina, 1968), the union claimed that 70% of the CSC faculty and 50% of the NISC faculty were striking or honoring the picket line. The two presidents offered different data, with President Byrd of CSC insisting that no more than a quarter of the faculty was out, and Sachs of NISC reporting that two-thirds of NISC's classes were meeting and manned by regular members of the faculty.

By April 5 the Tribune account revealed even greater differences.

The union claimed 180 of CSC's faculty out, while the college reported less than one-third out to the Tribune ("Union To Keep Up," 1968). For NISC the union told the paper that 113 of NISC's faculty were out, but the college claimed less than 45 in number were out.

During the strike period, the AAUP chapter at CSC apparently conducted an unofficial poll of all faculty members at CSC on their preference for a collective bargaining agent. The above April 5 Tribune article carried the results of that poll, in which, according to the AAUP, of 186 CSC faculty voting on a preference for an agent, 61 selected the college senate, 59 the union, and 40 the AAUP.

Tempo had only one issue during the period of the strike. In an article ("CSC faculty members," 1968) on April 11, 1968, it reported on a student body meeting on April 4 in which the strike issue and a student boycott were debated. The results of the meeting, although not spelled out in the April 11 article, were reported in the next issue of Tempo, May 15, 1968, in which a summary of the whole event was run ("CSC faculty strikes out", 1968). The summary commented on the meeting and said the students "stayed in school" (p. 1).

On the night of April 4 a tragic event took place which may have affected the continuity of the strike. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was slain in Memphis. The following day riots broke out on the West and South sides of Chicago, some within a few blocks of the CSC campus.

Like many other Chicago institutions, CSC and NISC cancelled classes both the following Monday and Tuesday, April 8 and 9.

By its April 12 issue, the Tribune was reporting only that "some faculty" ("College Board Chief," 1968, p. 4) continued to strike, and quoted Byrd as saying that at "the height of the strike" (p. 4) only 70 of

the 230 faculty stayed away.

Finally, on April 18, as already noted, the date of the monthly Board meeting, in the Board minutes the notation was made that "Mr. Nelson reported to the Board on the matter of the 'striking' teachers at the two Chicago colleges. It was reported by the presidents of the two institutions that the strikers had returned to their positions as of 10 A.m. on the day of this Board meeting." (p. 389).

Two earlier references to the strike in the April 18 minutes were identical statements in the reports of both Byrd and Sachs that the subject of "appointment, promotion, and tenure matter is subject to reconsideration upon verification of any error with reference to the status of an employee, i.e.,whether or not he is fulfilling his contract or is 'on strike' " (p. 388).

The Tribune the following day ("Rejects Demands," 1968) told of the end of the "15-day walkout" (p.14) and quoted Richard Nelson, the Board Chairman, as having told the faculty members they are returning "with the full understanding that all grades will be given and no compensation will be paid for time on strike or overtime for completing their work" (p. 14).

Tempo in its later summary reported that Nelson "in an official letter, states he has no idea why the strike is over since there was no hint of reconciliation" ("CSC faculty strikes out," 1968, p.1).

The headline chosen by the CSC editors in Tempo for their summary account of the strike, "CSC faculty strikes out," may have been more than just college humor because by the May meeting only two items appeared in the minutes as a reminder there had been a strike. Nelson was reported to have heard from the union, although the subject matter is not mentioned, and to have asked the two presidents to "explore with appropriate faculty

groups to see if there is a disposition to discuss issues as presented in his letter of April 17 to Dr. J.H.Jackson" (p.409). Neither the issues under discussion nor Dr. Jackson's identity was disclosed in the minutes.

In the second reference to the strike, the Board approved the promotion and tenure recommendations deferred at the April meeting for any faculty who had been on strike at the time of the meeting.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1969

Fiscal Year 1969 was quite a contrast to FY68 with few items of more than minor consequence to this study.

Concurrent with the dealing with the union and discussions of collective bargaining during FY68 had been reports by the executive officer of meetings of the Board's ad hoc committee on Faculty Representation. A draft of a proposal for a Board Faculty Council was presented to the Board in July, and after many drafts, the establishment of a Council of Faculties was approved in November to be ratified by the faculty of the four institutions.

The proposal would consist of three elected representatives and three alternatives from each school, with rotating chairmanships and membership on each of three committees: General Policy, Finance, and Professional Relations.

At the October meeting that year a phrase which would appear often in the future was first mentioned: A cost of living study, which had been contracted for by the Board, was discussed. The executive officer commented that the consultant economists had found there was "very little difference overall in the cost of living in Chicago, Charleston [the site of Eastern], and Macomb [the site of Western] " (p. 62). A suggestion was

noted that the consultants should meet with the Joint Faculty Salary Committee.

At the October meeting a reminder of the strike arose. The Legal Officer reported on a suit filed on behalf of the faculty members at CSC and NISC for their salaries during the period they were on strike in April, 1968. The suit was filed by the AFT CCCT union. References to that suit continued in the Legal Officer's reports for the next five years with no record of its ever having been settled.

The Council of Faculties was formally reported established at the February meeting. Board disappointment was expressed in the small vote on the Council issue at some of the institutions, indicating the possibility of lack of interest in the proposal. The vote referred to was not recorded in the minutes of the Board but can be found in the February minutes of the new Council of Faculties itself.

The vote on the proposal to create a Council of Faculties was:

| Institution | Total Eligible | Total Voting | Yes | No | Unmarked |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CSC | 239 | 132 | 120 | 11 | 1 |
| Eastern | 435 | 69 | 61 | 8 | |
| NISC | 247 | 140 | 128 | 12 | |
| Western | 598 | 442 | 420 | 22 | |
| Total | 1,519 | 783 | 729 | 53 | 1 |

Two personnel matters arose in FY69 in connection with CSC faculty. In November the Legal Officer reported litigation by Cary B. Lewis, associate professor, who sued on the basis of racial discrimination. This suit was reported settled with a judgment for the Board in May 1969.

In February the executive officer reported meeting with a faculty and student group from CSC and after "fine talks" (p. 119) recommended the CSC administration reconsider its decision on non-retention of two faculty members at CSC. No reference was made to the faculty members by name in February. However, in April the Chairman said discussion at the Executive Session of the case of Ida Lalor and Benjamin Solomon at CSC confirmed the sound judgment of President Byrd and his administration in the decision for non-reappointment.

The Legal Counsel at the same meeting noted that a suit filed by Lalor and Solomon was pending. Such a suit with Local 1600 as co-plaintiff was reported filed in May, and references to that suit continue in the Board's Legal Officer's reports on the status of the suit until July 1972 when it was dismissed.

Besides being involved in suits against the Board, the union also continued to seek actively approval for a collective bargaining election at CSC and NISC; to no avail, however. Letters from the union requesting such an election were reported at both the April and May meetings, but McKelvey was directed merely to reply reiterating the policy statement of January 1968.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1970

Fiscal Year 1970 was rather uneventful. Two new CSC faculty personnel items arose. One of them again concerned Cary Lewis of CSC requesting promotion to professor. The other was a joint appeal by two non-retained CSC faculty.

Lewis' request, along with a non-retention case at Northeastern, was referred in July to an ad hoc committee of the Board. By September, this committee sustained the Northeastern non-retention decision but could come to no decision on Lewis after a meeting"on August 4, 1969 from 9:00A.M. to 11:40 P.M. (sic)" (p. 40). By November the committee reported its recommendation on Lewis, which recommendation was reported adopted in January. The recommendation itself was never cited; however, since university personnel records show Lewis was promoted to full professor at the beginning of the next academic year, the finding obviously was in his favor.

CSC professors Paull and Nedelsky, two faculty appealing their non-retention, eventually filed suit in May. As in the others, AFT's Local 1600 was a co-plaintiff. References to this suit were made by the Legal Officer until April 1974 when it was reported terminated in the Board's favor.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1971

In Fiscal Year 1971 no reference to either collective bargaining or the faculty union appears at all, other than in the occasional mentions by the Legal Officer of the three ongoing suits. Instead, one can infer a growing participation in governance by the faculty through the Council of Faculties from the extent to which the COF viewpoint seems to be sought.

As 1971 began, the Chairman of the Council of Faculties (COF), after a year in office, reported, in general terms, of his satisfaction with the operation of the COF and its relationship with the Board and the Council of Presidents.

As the year developed, evidence appeared that the COF was in fact deeply involved in policy matters, with references to COF input in such matters as faculty evaluation, criteria for ranks, and department chairman selection.

References were also made on a number of occasions to the returning of policy under consideration to both the COF and the Council of Presidents (COP) for revision or for further discussion to resolve the differences between the two Councils. A good example came in April when the Board made an important concession to the faculty. The Board approved a policy for a university-wide budget committee which would be composed of a democratically selected group of faculty who would "play an active role (in) the preparation of all budgets . . . periodic review of all budgets . . . transfer of significant amounts among internal budget items" (pp. 190-191).

The final wording of this policy provides an illustration of COF input. An examination of the COF minutes of March 1, 1971 shows that three key phrases in the Board's original draft were recommended for delation by the COF. None of the three appears in the final document, and each was significant.

The original wordage called for a "university-wide budget advisory committee." The word "advisory" was deleted by the COF. Initially, the committee was to take "an active role in assisting appropriate administrative officers in the preparation of budgets." The words "assisting appropriate administrative officers" were deleted as requested by the COF. And finally after COF recommendation, a parenthetical element proposed by the Board which would add to the committee "possible student and other campus group representatives" was also dropped.

As commented on, no union contact was reported, other than regarding suits in which the union was a co-plaintiff with CSU faculty. Moreover, the union may have indirectly lost some ground at CSC. In November an agreement had been signed which gave Local 1600 representation of the CSC clerical and technical employees. A vote to terminate the agreement with Local 1600, as of June 30, was reported at the June meeting.

Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1972

During Fiscal Year 1972 serious concerns about both salaries and governance began to arise.

In June the Board had directed the university salary committees in FY72 to give emphasis to merit and cost of living along with the customary experience and educational qualifications. Then in July 1971 a tuition increase approval was rescinded inasmush as the additional tuition charges were not to be reflected in the appropriations authorized. Furthermore, no salary increases whatsoever were approved because the approved FY72 funding was below that of FY71.

The Chairman of the COF complained in July that the faculty had been singled out by the Board in its seeking a reduction in overall expenditures to balance the budget cut.

As a result of the general assembly passing a special appropriation, budgets were finally increased enough to permit a 4.6% average increase in the salary budget to be effective after November 16, 1971.

During FY72 the COF went on record several times voicing dissatisfaction on other matters. The increased control by the Board of Higher

Education was of special concern. In November the COF chairman complained that control over program evaluation and program priorities was being "usurped by the Board of Higher Education" (p. 23). In May 1972 the COF expressed concern over the Role and Scope Statement for the four BOG institutions based on the Board of Higher Education's Master Plan. They especially noted their dislike for the statement from the Master Plan which said the "BOG system is not intended to be basically doctoral or research oriented" (p. 153).

The COF also sought Board support regarding personnel record-keeping and asked the Board and COP for a maximum of 60-day delay in replies to COF requests.

During FY72 in September CSC and NISC finally gained full university status with the other Board institutions through legislation which made them Chicago State University (CSU) and Northeastern Illinois State University (UNI) respectively.

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1973

FY73 began on a high note and during most of the year friction was minimal. Significant was the obvious combined activity of the faculties and Board in addressing a new concept in system-wide personnel evaluation. But in the spring the collective bargaining issue was raised by new voices, and multiple problems at CSU received intense Board scrutiny.

The increased involvment of the faculty in Board matters was confirmed by the statement of the retiring COF chairman. At the first meeting of the year in July, he said that he was "especially gratified to note how

many policies recommended by the COF had been adopted" ( p. 20) and expressed his appreciation to the Board.

A sytem-wide Professional Personnel Evaluation Procedure policy was adopted in April. This had been the subject of combined Board and COF attention since December. The position of the COF changed. In December it had endorsed system-wide evaluation. Later the COF Chairman reported that the faculty senates at Northeastern, Western, and Eastern had voted against system-wide evaluation. No reference was made to CSU, but it was said that Governors State University, the new BOG senior institution, which was just developing in the Far South Metropolitan area of Chicago, had no machinery as yet to react to any policy matters. The presidents also were said to have some misgivings about this drastic departure from individual campus control of this volatile matter.

Also in April a new maternity leave policy was passed recognizing temporary disabilities for pregnancy as causing one to be eligible for entitled non-cumulative sick leave. The COF Chairman commented on the evolution of this policy since 1967, no doubt referring to the suit by CSU professor Dierickx. At that same April meeting the COF raised the submerged issue of collective bargaining with a motion passed by the Council for Board consideration:

> If the state law should change to permit collective bargaining and all that it entails, and if the faculties wish to use these procedures, we recommend that the COF seek to coordinate such intentions so that one agency (AAUP, educational associations, a union, even the COF itself) will represent all of the BOG schools for the Common good (pp. 119-120).

No response from the Board was recorded.

Then in June for the first time, the issue was raised by downstate faculty. Three faculty members from Western Illinois appeared to speak on behalf of holding an election for collective bargaining among the Western faculty. The three represented AAUP, AFT, and the Illinois Association of Higher Education.

The executive officer did reply, albeit ambiguously, to the Western faculty presentation, stating that it was "appropriate this discussion be held today . . . [but] not much more can be said at this time" (p. 165), and he recommended additional conversations with the Board staff.

During the spring of 1973 problems at CSU consumed a great deal of the Board minutes. The major problem was a report made in April by President Byrd on the discovery of financial irregularities in connection with the move to the new campus at 95th Street and King Drive. The move had taken place in November 1972. He said that the moving expenses had been much greater than anticipated, and a strong suspicion existed that illegal fund-handling had taken place. CSU would be forced to cut expenses drastically and present a new budget to get through the balance of the fiscal year.

Byrd predicted, however, that the financial investigation by the attorney general and auditors would reveal the financial irregularities to be smaller than circulated. He was referring here to the charges of fraud and mismanagement which had received major press attention in the Chicago media. Byrd's predictions proved fairly accurate in that the eventual findings were that less than $30,000 had been embezzled. In June 1974 in the Board minutes, for example, the Legal Officer reported that the attorney general had secured $20,731 in restitution for the embezzled funds, most of which

had come from falsifying moving charges.

But Byrd's problems were not just financial. At the May meeting the CSU faculty senate chairperson requested Board postponement of approval of Byrd's recommendations for tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave because of "possible irregularities in the procedure" (p. 154). The executive officer commented on having discussed these charges with Byrd, and the Board did not rescind the recommendations, which were already approved.

At the May meeting the COF also pounced on Byrd. The COF chairman, Titman of CSU, made a statement based on the report of a special COF committee created to address CSU problems. In summary the statement urged the Board to investigate all conditions at CSU broader than the fiscal mismanagement and spoke of "serious flaws in the administration of the University," warning that matters at CSU could become the Board's "Watergate Affair" (p. 141). No Board response was recorded.

Criticisms of CSU continued in June centering on the nursing program. The CSU faculty senate chairperson protested the request by Byrd for the appointment of a new head of the nursing program. whose title "dean" was claimed by the senate to be inconsistent with the university constitution. After Byrd responded that the title had been a consideration in securing the appointee, the Board approved his request.

Further criticisms of the CSU nursing program concerned a letter on a demonstration on May 9 by CSU nursing students and on the fact that the Board staff had been meeting regularly with the nursing students.

The June meeting, in addition to addressing CSU's problems, also under-

lined the Board's continuing dilemma regarding faculty salaries. The ongoing philosophical conflict between cost of living requirements and the Board's belief in awarding salary increases on merit is clear from the executive officer's report on salary increases for the next year. The Board had recommended that 40% of the requested 5% total increase go for basic increments with 60% set aside for merit. The Board of Higher Education had changed this request to a 50/50 ratio. The Governor reduced the increase to approximately 3% and allocated 80% to a basic increase and and only 20% to merit.

Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1974

Commencing with proceedings for FY74, the annual summary format used for the previous years has been abandoned. Instead, a strict chronological format has been adopted for the balance of the study. The number of items which affected the eventual outcome of the collective bargaining issue mount in number from FY74 on. To summarize would destroy the continuity.

Another factor encouraging the choice of the straight chronological format was the apparent decision of the Secretary of the Board, the executive officer, to report almost verbatim the comments on various items. His record-keeping is unlike that of the earlier years of the Board proceedings when only limited record was made of the commentary which preceded any significant vote.

With the minutes reported on a month-to-month basis, summaries of the comments of various individuals appear along with the item under discussion.

Recording the varying viewpoints seems as germane to the process which led to collective bargaining as the record of the actual vote alone.

On the few occasions where the Board minutes were not sufficiently clear, the Minutes of the Council of Faculties were the customary source for clarification. However, when Walters, the new executive officer, was introduced, additional outside sources were used to confirm his credentials on the bargaining issue. And when the final collective bargaining vote stimulated comments on the political nature of the vote, it seemed advisable to turn for further explanation to the report on the issue in the Chicago Tribune, although it is granted that the Tribune itself is by no means apolitical.

Otherwise, a chronological examination month by month is the source of all that follows.

July 12, 1973

The Board rejected a COF request that faculty senate chairpersons be permitted to speak relative to any item in his/her president's report to the Board. The reason given for the rejection was that problems should be settled within each institution and that proper channels permit faculty members to request appearance on the Board agenda. The retiring COF Chairman Titman of CSU, presented a final statement. In summary, he complimented the Board on its improvement since 1965, but he regretted the increasing complexity of Board business which he claimed was either falling on understaffed Board personnel or being delegated to president. He saw as a result increased litigation for the Board. He recommended the Board recongize and utilize the faculty, professional educators some with 30-40 years of experience.

September 13, 1973

Milton Byrd submitted his resignation as president of CSU effective June 30, 1974, having found "the past seven years a rewarding and stimulating administrative challenge" (p. 36).

Executive Officer Morton, in responding to the WIU faculty appearance at the June meeting, acknowledged the faculty's position particularly regarding "economic deterioration" (p. 44) but saw no advantage in approving a collective bargaining election at WIU. He recommended that should collective bargaining be pursued at a later date, the total five-institution BOG system be "the minimal bargaining unit" (p. 44).

On salaries, COF Chairman Douglas urged the Board to consider the incorporation of cost of living or similar economic indices when planning system-wide budgets.

October 18, 1973

The COF reported that in response to Morton's position, expressed at the September meeting, that if there is to be collective bargaining it would be system-wide, an informational poll of the faculty of all five schools would be held getting opinions on collective bargaining.

Three items concerned salaries. The COF asked the Board to request a supplemental appropriation from the legislature to yield a 5% partial cost-of-living adjustment. President Mullen of Northeastern presented a statement from UNI's budgetary council asking the Board to adopt a cost of living escalator clause independent of salary increases. And the Board itself passed a resolution for presentation to the Governor and General Assembly requesting "urgant and expeditious consideration" (p. 54) of providing additional resources.

November 15, 1973

COF Chairman Douglas presented the results of the Informational Poll on faculty sentiment regarding collective bargaining. The results are not included in the Board minutes but as reported in the COF minutes are as follows:

| School | Ballots Distributed | Ballots Returned | Approved | Opposed | Undecided | Spoiled |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eastern | 580 | 265 (45%) | 176 (66%) | 60 (23%) | 28 (11%) | 1 |
| CSU | 260 | 190 (73%) | 181 (95%) | 5 (2.6%) | 4 (2.4%) | - |
| Governors | 106 | 74 (70%) | 47 (63%) | 17 (24%) | 10 (13%) | - |
| Northeastern | 384 | 218 (57%) | 158 (72%) | 22 (10%) | 22 (10%) | 16 |
| Western | 711 | 473 (66%) | 326 (68%) | 72 (15%) | 78 (16%) | - |
| Total | 2,041 | 1,220 (60%) | 885 (74%) | 196 (14%) | 142 (12%) | 17 |

No Board response to the poll is recorded.

In light of the significance of Ms. Felicitas Berlanga's abrupt dismissal as a Board member a year later, note should be made of a motion passed by the Board at this meeting on her behalf. The Board went on record as not opposed to confirmation by the Senate of the General Assembly of Felicitas Berlanga as a member of the Board with the motion as proposed by Board member Relph "in view of problems Miss Berlanga has had with confirmation" (p. 77). She had been appointed in July, 1973 to fill a two-year unexpired term, while she was a senior at Illinois State University.

January 10, 1974

In response to "an ongoing req uest" (p. 90) from the Council of Faculties, and in light of the fact that five students by state statute sat with the Board, the Board approved a greater voice for the COF by permitting the COF Chairman to "sit in all open Board meetings and be recognized,

where appropriate, to make recommendations, provide information and comment on matters under consideration" (p. 90) without actually debating issues. The Board also approved his sitting with the Board in closed sessions unless non-Board members are excluded.

A difference of opinion in connection with salary distribution was apparent in the Executive Officer's Report. The proposal for FY75 was for a salary increase of from 5.5 to 6% with the Board's original recommendation that between 30 and 50% go for merit recognition, but the Council of Presidents proposed that between 20 and 40% go for merit, while the COF wanted only 16 2/3% for merit. The COP position was eventually adopted after discussion on whether the merit system indeed works and as to whether the term "cost of living" is a labor market term rather than an educational one (pp. 84-86).

March 14, 1974

The COF report included a resolution from the Western Illinois Senate urging the Board to move on collective bargaining. Later in the meeting a Mr. Arthur Donant, not further identified, is reported to have taken the microphone to address the Board on collective bargaining. Although his comments are not recorded, Board Chairman Ladd's response is recorded in which he reminded him that the Board staff had sent him the historical perspective of the Board on the issue and added that the Board "may wish to reconsider its position but it does not have time . . . today" (p. 121).

April 25, 1974

Benjamin H. Alexander was approved as new president of CSU as of July 1, 1974. In the accompanying Board comments, much emphasis was placed on Alexander's commitment to maintaining CSU's multi-racial character. CSU's

student body had changed racially during the previous decade, and by 1974 was approximately two-thirds black; Alexander would be the first black president of a four year institution in Illinois. He was also given a tenured position as Professor of Chemistry, a matter which would be addressed at subsequent meetings by the faculty.

The COF Chairman read a COF resolution which asked the Board "to authorize the faculties . . . to express their position on collective bargaining by means of a referendum" (p. 128). Chairman Douglas added that the report of the Informational Poll in the Fall of 1973 seemed to have been discounted as not significant. Board Chairman Ladd received the request to "think upon" (p. 128)

May 16, 1974

CSU's Byrd was attacked one last time at this meeting. A black faculty group from CSU appeared before the Board citing discrimination toward black faculty in salaries, tenure, promotion, underemployment, hidden overloads, underrepresentation in positions of power, and asked for a $50,000 inequity appropriation, adding the comment that the "Black Faculty had lost complete faith in President Byrd" (p. 145). Byrd responded, denying the allegations, and cited the increase from 0 to 41 black administrators, an area over which he had some control. He concurred with the facts regarding the lower salaries, lower rank, and lower rate of promotion of blacks but remarked on the black faculty's 11 year average of experience compared to the white's 14 years and the black's higher starting salary in recent years. The Board asked for a full report from CSU and the Board staff.

The COF Chairman in his report thanked the Board staff for its help in securing "catch-up" salary legislation, referring here to the difference

between BOG faculty salaries and those of faculty at other state institutions. The COF Report also asked for a written rationale from the Board for having granted tenure to an incoming president --Alexander of CSU, although unnamed-- in light of the demand for stringent criteria for faculty tenure and the fact that the other tenured BOG presidents had followed Board policy of three years minimum service and demonstrated capacity for college level teaching.

COF Chairman Douglas again raised the question of a sanction from the Board for a referendum on collective bargaining. He said an official Board sanction would mean no more than authorization to the COF to conduct the canvass and not a commitment to its outcome. Douglas wanted it to be more that the previous fall's "straw poll" in which 60% of the faculty voted with 74% favoring system-wide collective bargaining. A motion supporting such a canvass was made but eventually was withdrawn after agreement that faculty freedom permitted such a poll without Board sanction.

June 13, 1974

Chairman Ladd commented again on the failure of BOG's appropriated budget to keep salaries on a par with those at other state institutions and on an effort to include in next year's budget a 3% increase for catch-up money.

Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1975

July 11, 1974

COF Chairman announced the Council's decision to proceed with an Official Council Referendum of the five faculties in the fall, solely on

the issue of system-wide collective bargaining without consideration of agent. With a favorable majority, he said the COF would request the Board to conduct an agent election. No Board response to this announcement was noted.

The COF again raised the question of the award of tenure to incoming administrative personnel. Chairman Ladd responded that the Board had "certain prerogatives at its disposal" (p. 23) and therefore can act without approval from every constituency. He said the Board in its "wisdom" (in quotes in minutes) made the decision, and he considered the matter settled.

September 12, 1974

The Council of Presidents distributed its statement on a position on collective bargaining. No copy or summary of the statement is included in the minutes. However, comments at subsequent meetings would indicate their opposition to bargaining, unless it be accompanied by enabling legislation from the state legislature.

CSU President Alexander reported on inequities at CSU and stated that the Board attorney had directed CSU to look at all minorities and women in determining inequities.

October 24, 1974

Both the COF and Chairman Ladd discussed the salary issue. COF Chairman reported that the COF would likely recommend that no merit increases be made for FY76 until cost of living increases were covered. Ladd emphasized the need for "catch-up" for BOG faculties in FY76 and cited a survey of faculty salaries at ten State of Illinois institutions in which the four BOG schools ranked 7,8,9,and 10. Governors State was the exception

ranking fourth because of its policy of giving all teaching faculty and administrators faculty status but no rank.

November 21, 1974

COF Chairman Marshall requested that the Board consider the Council request for collective bargaining at its January meeting based on the referendum held in October. The results of that vote are not in the minutes but are included in the COF Report. Summarizing, the results were:

Total ballots distributed ... 1,951

Total ballots returned ..... 1,585 (81.24%)

Voting Yes ..... 1,313 (67.29% of all eligible; 82.4% of those voting)

Individual results:

CSU -- 233 Yes or 89% of 261 eligible
EIU -- 289 Yes or 58% of 499 eligible
GSU -- 80 Yes or 58% of 139 eligible
UNI -- 202 Yes or 59% of 340 eligible
WIU -- 509 Yes or 72% of 712 eligible

Marshall acknowledged the Presidents' opposition to collective bargaining without enabling legislation but recalled "the Board's innovativeness in the past" (p. 86), pointing out that the Council of Faculties was "one of the first in the U.S. and created without legislation" (p. 87) and that the Council of Students had also been formed without legislative authorization.

The Council of Students, not previously mentioned in this study, was created in 1971 to permit formal representation at the Board meetings of a student from each school. However, in 1974 Illinois statute prescribed an elected student representative from each governed school as a non-voting member of its governing board. The Council of Students chairman had reported

at the October meeting on a resolution from the students to dissolve the Council because of the new formal student representation on the Board itself. Judging by the paucity of comments and action reported in the minutes by the Council of Students, one could assume that the Council had never played an active role in Board activities.

COF Chairman Marshall then added that the COF had voted unanimously to forego any claim to serve as bargaining agent for the faculty but rather would continue to function as advisory group to the Board.

January 9, 1975

Before the planned discussion on collective bargaining ensued, Chairman Ladd reported that the Board of Higher Education had made several cuts in the BOG budget request for FY76 overall but had approved a $500,000 extra salary allotment for use in providing catch-up amounts for those BOG faculty lagging behind their counterparts in other state systems.

Collective bargaining discussion covered three pages. Most of that discussion concerned whether it was appropriate to come to a decision on collective bargaining prior to legislation or to await legislation and then decide on its merits for the BOG. A compromise motion was offered which would give the faculty the right to elect a collective bargaining agent at such time as the legislature passed enabling legislation. This motion failed to carry 3 to 5.

Finally the Board approved Chairman Ladd's recommendation for a Board committee to study collective bargaining, to recommend whether the Board should engage in bargaining, and, if so, to propose appropriate legislation.

The committee was to consist of three Board members (Bufalino as chairman, Phalin, and Relph), UNI President Mullen, COF Chairman Marshall,

and CSU student representative Washington. Interesting was Ladd's explanation of his choice of Washington, based on his being a minority student and from "CSU where interest on the issue is strong" (p. 100).

On strictly a CSU matter, the Legal Officer reported on steps taken with the Department of Labor regarding the determination by CSU that there had been lack of compliance at CSU with the Equal Pay Act. This was in connection with pay for women faculty members during the three previous years. In order to avoid a suit against CSU, the Board approved going to the legislature to seek supplemental appropriations to cover this situation.

On salaries, the COF stated that if the $500,000 catch-up money were funded in FY76, the COF would prefer a flat equal dollar amount to each faculty member rather than a percentage allocation. The COF chairman said this would give proportionally more help to the lower-paid faculty.

Marshall also expressed his appreciation for being included on the Collective Bargaining Committee as a "step in the right direction" (p. 106) and in keeping with COF's ongoing request for faculty representation on every Board committee.

March 13, 1975

The Collective Bargaining committee announced that it had held two meetings, with presentations from representatives of AFT and the Illinois Education Association. The committee planned a third in March, with presentations from two state senators and a consultant from the Institute of Management and Industrial Relations at Rutgers.

One important faculty-Board governance issue was settled at this meeting. In connection with tenure recommendations in which the president's recommendations differed from the faculty advisory body, agreement was reached

which would permit a faculty representative to present the faculty's point of view before a Board decision.

In a decision made on the following year's salary allocation, faculty influence was clear. The Executive Officer recommended that any catch up money be distributed on a flat amount basis, as the COF had asked in January. In addition, the regular increment would be distributed 80% for cost of living and only 20% for merit, a compromise between the COP and the COF. The COP earlier had spoken for 60% cost of living; the COF for 100% cost of living.

April 10, 1975

Chairman Bufalino of the Collective Bargaining committee predicted the committee would present their recommendations at the May Board meeting, having heard from all constituencies at their hearings. In addition to those referred to in the March minutes, Bufalino mentioned an AAUP representative, President Milpass of Western, and several faculty senate representatives. A summary of the transcript was to be sent to all Board members.

May 8, 1975

The report of the ad hoc committee on Collective Bargaining and the subsequent discussion comprise 13 pages in the Board's minutes for the May meeting.

The proceedings began with a recommendation from the committee that the Board move to establish guidelines for collective bargaining, and then hold an election for an agent and implement a collective bargaining process "either with or without enabling legislation" (p. 205). The committee further recommended that to set guidelines for collective bargaining a Task Force be named composed of three voting members of the Board, one to be chairman, a student member of the Board, the chairman of the

the COF, one of the presidents, and the Board executive officer.

Presentations followed from parties who had requested time on the agenda. Margaret Schmid, Chairperson, AFT Faculty Council-BOG, praised the committee's recommendation which could resolve "the tremendous conflict in our system" (p. 206), but she protested the change the committee had made in the new committee's membership which originally had been "faculty" and now was just the COF Chairperson.

Martha Friedman, President of the State AAUP, said she considered it inappropriate that the Task Force decided on the scope of the negotiations and the composition of the bargaining unit. She urged Board support for passage of legislation for public employee collective bargaining in Illinois.

A letter was read from the president of the Western Illinois AAUP chapter which in substance said that AAUP endorses collective bargaining but only with enabling legislation. The letter also said the chapter prefers individual university negotiation rather than system-wide.

John McCluskey, of the Illinois Education Association, spoke of an IEA bill before both State houses providing faculties the right to collective bargaining and asked support of such legislation. He recommended collective bargaining to the Board because it would give the Board, as the negotiator, constant supervision of "faculty and administration politics" (p. 208).

Speaking for the Council of Presidents, Engbretsen of Governors State reaffirmed the presidents' opposition to bargaining without legislation and quoted from the testimony of the senators and researcher at the committee meetings who had all warned of problems without such legislation.

Chairman Ladd commented on having received no student request to testify that day. Board member Relph responded that the student representative to the committee had not attended the meetings, but that after notices went to all student bodies, the student body president from Western had testified.

Board members-only discussion followed. The charge was made that the committee had not complied with the Board's original directive because they had not presented the reasoning behind their recommendation nor had they recommended specific legislation.

The committee response was that their recommendation said that in the absence of legislation the Board establish its own rules.

A motion on the committee's recommendation evolved out of the Board conversation, although it was never spelled out in the minutes. This motion called for acceptance rather than adoption of the committee's report. The motion retained the Task Force recommendation but changed its composition to include just three members of the Board, the legal officer, and the executive officer. The original committee recommendation had included student, faculty, and president representatives.

This task force was charged with the task of examining " three things: collective bargaining or not, collective bargaining with legislation, collective bargaining without legislation" (p. 216).

In commenting on the motion, the COF Chairman protested the elimination of any faculty input on the new Task Force. Chairman Ladd responded, in a quotation used by the union frequently during the following months: "There is no denying that collective bargaining is an adversary process, and you don't plan your wars with your enemy in the war rooms" (p. 214).

This motion passed 5 to 2, with the negative votes from the committee members, Bufalino and Relph, who, based on their comments, were protesting the changes made in their recommendations and the delaying nature of the action.

Because of the references in the presentations to possible legislation, the Board agreed to give both the present executive officer and the incoming executive officer, who would join the staff July 1, the task of drawing up proposals on collective bargaining legislation which could be submitted to the legislature after review by the Board. It was agreed that if the time process called for a special meeting to consider such proposals, one should be called.

May 28, 1975

Just such a special meeting was held on May 28. Its objective was two-fold: to present for Board action nominations for the collective bargaining task force, and to discuss a preliminary draft by the incoming officer for proposed collective bargaining legislation.

Chairman Ladd, as called for in the Board by-laws, offered the names of three Board members to compose the Collective Bargaining Task Force. His nomineee's names are not included in the minutes, but presumably,the names did not include Relph and Bufalino, members of the earlier committee, in that initial discussion centered on the value of having input on the task force from Board members with previous experience on the subject.

The by-laws were voted suspended to avoid voting on the chairman's nominations. Davis stated he did not wish to serve on the committee and nominated Kaufamn and Lardner as the first two members with the third member to be nominated in open session. From Davis' comments, one could

assume that these two plus Davis were Ladd's original nominees. Eventually his motion carried as did a nomination by Davis for Relph to be the third member. She had been on the earlier committee and accepted inasmuch as Bufalino, the previous chairman, was absent. Kaufman as first named was to be chairman.

Important to note is that Lardner and Davis subsequently voted against collective bargaining and Kaufman and Relph for it. The substitution of Relph for Davis on the Task Force could be presumed to have had significant effect on the final proposal in favor of collective bargaining which came out of the Task Force.

Discussion of the mission of the committee centered on interpreting the previous month's minutes which, as noted above, were not specific. A summary which was said to have appeared in the Western Illinois faculty newsletter was read and accepted as sufficiently inclusive by Davis, who had the largest role in amending the motion as it was passed on May 8. This summary described the Task Force's assignment as follows:

> Evaluate the pros and cons of collective bargaining and its effect on the authority given to the BOG by the legislature; evaluate the effect of collective bargaining on the quality of education and the effect on other constituencies in an academic institution; investigate and evaluate what authority the BOG has to enter into collective bargaining which is compatible with the authority of the Governor's Office, the Legislature and the Board of Higher Education; and finally,recommend a course of action; not to enter into collective bargaining, to enter collective bargaining with enabling legislation, or to enter

without enabling legisaltion (p. 221).

The Board then turned to the draft of proposed legislation prepared by Donald Walters, the incoming executive officer. Walters, who was joining the BOG on July 1, was coming from Massachusetts where he was acting provost of the Massachusetts State College System. His experience there should have been good preparation for collective bargaining matters. Massachusetts, along with Michigan, first authorized bargaining by public employees in 1965, an action called by Carr and Van Eyck (1973) "the first decisive change in the law affecting faculty collective bargaining"(p. 210). Carr and Van Eyck also single out Walters as one of eight individuals to whom they acknowledge "our great appreciation" in the preface to their Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus (1973, p. xi).

According to Means and Semas (1976) Massachusetts currently has eleven public four-year institutions with faculty collective bargaining agreements. However, in Massachusetts the statute permitting collective bargaining "is generally viewed as excluding salary negotiations from the bargaining process" (Carr & Van Eyck, 1973, p. 253). Walters' experience therefore was in governance bargaining in Massachusetts; in Illinois, as will be seen, salaries will be the major bargaining issue.

Walter's proposal is not presented as such in the minutes, although discussion regarding it consumed nine pages of the minutes of the special meeting. This discussion centered on a preliminary draft which he described as addressing the kind of questions a Board should consider. Discussion covered such matters as the merits of a no-strike clause, the desirability of binding arbitration, the Board's role in negotiation under an arbitrator, and cost for staff to handle collective bargaining .

A motion by Davis which would insure inclusion in any recommendation to the legislature the commitment to final and binding arbitration

failed with only Davis voting in favor. Opposition to his motion stemmed from either a recognition that such a commitment would severely limit the Board's powers or simply a reluctance to preempt the finding of a committee which was to study and recommend a Board position.

The final resolution of the matter was purposely not formalized. Substantially the Board agreed that proposing legislation would be left to the executive officer to be done on an informal basis with the understanding that the Board generally agreed with the contents of the draft prepared by Walters, but that Walters should be aware of a general Board consensus showing a preference for both a no-strike clause and no binding arbitration.

The above discussion on legislation bore no fruit. No serious reference is made to the subject of proposing legislation in subsequent Board meetings, and as early 1977 no legislation had been passed.

June 12, 1975

The new Task Force on Collective Bargaining had not met by the time of this meeting, but the Chairman of the COF, Marshall, presented two COF statements on the issue. He prefaced them by commenting that he left the May meeting "with the deepest personal despair that I have ever felt (and) ... the faculty felt the same kind of frustration, the same type of despair" (p. 248). The first resolution said substantially that the COF acted with integrity in presenting faculty views on collective bargaining as did the Board committee and chided the Board for "devious procedures" (p. 249) through unnecessary study committees and unilateral decisions on issues. The second protested the exclusion of a faculty representative from the Task Force and the "cavalier" approach of the Board which had widened "the gulf between the Board and faculty" (p. 249).

## Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1976

Fiscal Year 1976 was the year of decision for the Board and brought in November a vote in favor of collective bargaining, debate on which is covered extensively below. The meetings that followed the favorable vote involved plans for implementation of collective bargaining and are a preview of the adversarial relationship between Board and faculty earlier predicted. Notable in FY76 also is the Board's surrender to the concept of cost of living as the first priority for salary increases.

July 31, 1976

The COF Chairman reported a COF recommendation that the item of merit pay be removed from consideration and that the salary increase be given across the board to attempt to match the rising cost of living. Engbretsen, president of GSU, presented a GSU's Committee recommendation also that merit be dispensed with, although he did not personally agree. The Board had earlier compromised between the President's request for a 60% basic cost of living increase with 40% for merit and the COF's request for 100% straight increase and had adopted the 80-20 split.

Also on salaries, Executive Officer Walters reported that whether one compared institutions by average salaries or by average in the various ranks with other Illinois state universities (excluding Univ. of Illinois), Eastern, Northeastern, Chicago State, and Western ranked last - - 7,8,9, and 10. Governors State with no faculty ranks was not in the comparison.

In connection with the Task Force on Collective Bargaining, the point was made to Mrs. Kaufman, the chairperson, that the committee was directed to examine the area of collective bargaining but the Board did not direct

Before Board member discussion, representatives of the faculty, students, and presidents spoke.

COF Chairperson in her remarks primarily protested the denial of faculty participation in the Task Force Report. Mills of Western representing the four AAUP chapters (excluding CSU which had 50 national AAUP members but no chapter) praised the task force report but reiterated AAUP's belief in enabling legislation before bargaining and in individual bargaining rather than system-wide bargaining because of the differences in the five schools.

Margaret Schmid, president of the AFT-BOG Council, urged passage of the recommendation and alluded to a petition gathered "in less than two weeks"(p. 87) signed by over 1,000 BOG faculty asking for an election by March 31, 1976.

COF Chairperson Pedroso also restated for the COF its vote of October 11, 1974, which removed the COF from consideration as a possible collective bargaining agent.

The five student representatives were asked to comment. Student comments generally focused on the need for student involvement in the bargaining process and on their concern that students would be hurt financially.

Wisdom of Western Illinois suggested student participation similar to the "Oregon system" (p. 89) as a separate and third bargaining unit attending all sessions with access to documents and opportunity to comment. Wisdom's recommendation almost matches the system of student participation adopted by the Board the following spring.

Executive Officer Walters and the five presidents were also asked to comment. Each at various lengths confirmed their previous position of total opposition to collective bargaining without enabling legislation.

the committee to come in with a specific action recommendation.

September 18, 1975

Discussion of priorities in presenting the Board budget for FY77 centered on the need for catch-up funds, and that the success in getting a 1% allocation in FY 76, half of the 2% requested, indicated the Board of Higher Education's similar commitment to catch-up. Later in the meeting Walters was directed to keep several priorities in mind in presenting the final budget, with faculty salaries and the catch-up monies the first two on the list of priorities.

November 20, 1975

The meeting opened with Chairman Ladd reading a letter from Governor Walker, received at the Central Office the day before, advising the appointment of Daniel Alvarez to a term on the Board expiring the third Monday in 1981 to the position "formerly held by Felicitas Berlanga" (p. 84). As will be seen, this appointment may have been the deciding factor in the culmination of over ten years of discussion on collective bargaining.

The minutes of the November meeting which concerned collective bargaining fill 19 pages. Highlights of remarks from a wide variety of participants are included here to illustrate the various viewpoints.

The discussion began with the recommendation of the Task Force which called for:

> The granting of academic employees the right to an election to determine whether they want collective bargaining, and if so, then to hold an election to determine their bargaining agent, and that the Executive Officer implement the results of such an election forthwith (p. 94).

Comments and discussion by the Board members followed. Each apparently was asked to comment in turn because the minutes initially are individual statements rather than debate.

Kaufman, the maker of the motion and the chairperson of the Task Force, in summary said that most state employees have a right to bargain and to deny the faculty the right would be discriminatory. She urged the Board, because of its understanding of the uniqueness of faculty, to set a precedent for future legislation just for higher education.

Fay said that as a member of the State Federation of Labor he had seen collective bargaining bills in the legislature many times with no action. He suggested that proper legislation would best come after the fact rather than through a statute that would need many amendments in practice.

Lardner, a member of the Task Force committee, spoke against the motion, citing the lack of legislation as a serious obstacle. He cited the responsibility of the Board to students, to the institutions themselves, and to the taxpayers in proper utilization of funds.

Relph, a Task Force member, and a member of the previous committee on collective bargaining, spoke in favor of the motion, and in doing so responded to various concerns expressed. She noted that the input of faculty and students in the earlier committee was a factor in this report. She claimed collective bargaining would not erode collegiality any more than already eroded, and she cited other instances where the Board had taken action without regard for the other college governing systems.

Davis in his remarks mentioned receiving a number of calls urging him to vote yes for labor and not an anti-labor no. Although pro-labor, he

said a yes-vote without a source of tax dollars to pay for it would not be received well by the General Assembly. He recommended instead that the Board go on record as favoring collective bargaining with enabling legislation, and he then offered an amendment "with enabling legislation" to the original motion.

The Board discussion then became informal with most of the comments from those in favor of amending the original motion to include legislation. They emphasized primarily the financial bind that collective bargaining without statute might bring to the BOG system. Worth noting, however, may be chairman Ladd's comments on the political aspects of the vote. This is the first instance in a reading of over ten years of Board proceedings that a reference was made to the member's political ties. In speaking for the amendment, he said in summary that collective bargaining is "not a constitutional right, but that it may be "a political right" if you have "the raw power" that has developed on the issue. He added that he had never once been contacted about his vote on the Board since he was appointed by a Republican governor but that he knew "that there has been considerable pressure placed on this issue by the Governor's office" (p. 96).

A vote was called on the amendment to wait for legislation which failed 4 to 5. This was followed immediately by a vote on the original motion which was carried 5 to 4. After the vote, Cicero, who had voted against the motion, asked the Board members to forget exactly what had happened and support the motion that was passed. Ladd endorsed Cicero's comment and pledged his support but added that he hoped "this is the last time that this Board ever is pressured politically on any issues and that politics is injected into any Board decision" (p. 97).

Relph responded that other issues on the Board have been political and called Ladd's comment "unfortunate" (p. 97). Ladd declined to retract it because he said the independence of the Board and the system "is in great jeopardy" (p .97).

The Board members in meetings that followed this one took their own advice, and no official reference ever is made to the acrimonious discussion which took place at the November meeting nor to the political affiliations of the Board members. However, because the November vote is the climax of this entire paper, there seems need to turn elsewhere to gain some further insight into the political ramifications of the vote and the comments surrounding it. The Chicago Tribune is by no means an apolitical newspaper, but instead frequently takes a strong Republican stance. Nevertheless, because no other written source is available on the issue, two Tribune editorials and a news story within a few days of the vote are cited below as at least one view of the political ramifications of the vote for collective bargaining.

The Tribune in a Sunday November 23 editorial titled "A blow to public higher education" called the decision sinister in that the margin was provided by Daniel Alvarez on the first day of his term on the Board. The Tribune accused incumbent Democrat Governor Walker of packing the Board with the Nov.20 vote in mind "as a political payoff to the union lobby"(sect. 2,p.4).

On Monday November 24, the Tribune carried a news story (Lauerman, 1975) which charged that Felicitas Berlanga was removed from the Board because she refused to yield to political pressure from Governor Walker's office. Berlanga was said to have told the reporter that Tito Pacheco, a Walker aide, had contacted her twice on Tuesday night before the Thursday Board

meeting to tell her that the Governor wanted collective bargaining to pass. She said that after telling him on both occasions that she could not support it without enabling legislation, she received a third call on Wednesday morning, the day before the Board meeting, and was told that her services on the Board were no longer needed.

Berlanga had been a student Board of Higher Education member and was appointed to the BOG in July 1973 by Governor Walker as a full voting member, to complete another's unexpired term. That term had ended in January 1975 but under the law she continued to act until reappointed or a successor named.

According to Lauerman in the Tribune, Pacheco was Walker's aide for Latino affairs in Chicago. The Tribune reporter said Pacheco admitted he had tried to influence Berlanga's vote on orders of a Walker aide in Springfield but denied any "armtwisting."

Lauerman also reported Alvarez' own comments in which he said he had been informed early in the week of his own appointment and denied being asked to vote for collective bargaining. The news story states that he told the Tribune he did because of his belief in it as a basic right.

The Tribune in the same story said that Alvarez had been Walker's aide for Latino affairs in Chicago until about May 1975, and was now director of Casa Central, a Chicago social service agency. On Wednesday, November 26, the Tribune followed up with another editorial ("Subversion," 1975) recounting the Berlanga story and urging the defeat of Walker at the polls. Unfortunately no other written commentary is available on the matter.

In concluding this discussion of the issue, one last pertinent bit of additional information should be: the recorded vote of each Board member, his or her appointment date, and the name of the governor making the appointment.

Those voting for collective bargaining: Relph, appointed July 1973 by Walker (Dem.); Bufalino, appointed September 1974 by Walker (Dem.); Kaufman, appointed April 1975 by Walker (Dem.); Fey, appointed May 1975 by Walker (Dem.); Alvarez, appointed November 1975 by Walker (Dem.). Those voting against collective bargaining were: Ladd, appointed July 1971 by Ogilvie (Rep.); Lardner, appointed July 1971 by Ogilvie (Rep.); Cicero, appointed July 1973 by Walker (Dem.); and Davis, appointed July 1973 by Walker (Dem.).

January 22, 1976

Board member Lardner reported on the holding of an executive session to consider a draft of regulations for implementing the collective bargaining resolution. He added that because the Board sees adoption of regulations as an exercise in governance, there would be no disclosure of its content until after further consideration.

Walters summarized the Board of Higher Education's recommendation for FY77 budget for the BOG schools: BOG had requested an overall 12% budget increase for FY77; BHE recommended a 9.3% increase for the system, unless a tuition increase was approved which would add 3.3%% to the BHE recommendation. He added that regarding salaries the BHE had recommended a 5% increase for all but the lowest-salaried employees who would receive 7%. A tuition increase would raise both 2%.

GSU student representative Ashford expressed concern about linking tuition increases to faculty salary increases.

COF Chairperson Pedroso told of the COF's great displeasure over the Board's excluding her from the special executive session called the night before to discuss the collective bargaining procedures. Particularly upsetting was the presence there of the five presidents and five student Board members.

Legal Officer Dunn explained the Board's right to exclude others from executive sessions but that student Board members must be included by state law. Walters added that it was decided that discussion of employee entitlements must be done in the absence of any employee group including COF. Board member Alvarez suggested to the COF Chairperson that eventually she too would see the need for both sides to have private meetings. He said that although he at first had been concerned about attending the executive session with faculty excluded, he now saw the rightness of the decision. GSU president Engbretsen echoed a comment noted in the minutes of two years previous by the COF Chairman and praised the Board's "national leadership" (p. 128) in establishing a council of faculties and giving faculty a voice, unlike many boards in the country.

February 19, 1976

Lardner predicted that regulations for collective bargaining would be ready for approval at the March meeting, while COF Chairperson Pedroso again protested the exclusion of the COF from the previous evening's executive session reviewing those guidelines.

March 18, 1976

The Board was presented and approved regulations for collective bargaining. These regulations provided guidance for an initial referendum and , with a favorable vote, for a representative election. These regulations also provided definitions and procedures for the entire conduct of collective negotiations. Both the referendum and election were to be secret ballot under the supervision of a neutral third party. The unit was to be system-wide consisting of full-time teaching faculty, librarians, counselors, learning service staff, holding academic rank. It excluded chairpersons. Included as

negotiable would be salaries, fringe benefits, and a grievance procedure. The regulations also gave students a limited right to be present at the table.

Walters stated that a referendum would be held in either late April or early May to insure all schools would be in session and, if favorable, an election in the fall when all faculty would have returned. Pedroso said that all faculty would be informed that the regulations were developed at three executive sessions from which faculty were barred.

Despite collective bargaining, salary studies went on. CSU Professor Brockman for COF presented a faculty salary analysis which showed four of the five BOG schools ranking 9, 10, 11, and 12 among Illinois state institutions, with CSU having slipped into last place. For FY77 COF urged an 8% salary increase for cost of living and the first stage of a multi-year catch up program of 1.5%. Chairman Ladd asked the COF to help in a study comparing BOG salaries with like institutions around the country.

May 20, 1976

For one of the few times in this study of the Board minutes, faculty from other than CSU made strong protests to the Board. The Chairman of the Faculty Senates both at Northeastern and Western protested vehemently their president's tenure recommendations presented that day to the Board.

UNI's Hammond reported the University Assembly's 111 to 0 condemnation of the UNI president's rejection of a number of faculty-approved tenure candidates on the basis of the University becoming over-tenured. Hammond maintained that the 80% tenure position that President Mullen projected would not come about if new faculty were added to reduce the current 22 to 1 faculty-student ratio to a reasoable 16 or 18 to 1 ratio.

Western's Keeling spoke against President Milpass' recommendations on the basis of his ignoring various levels of decision-making at WIU

and imposing new standards for tenure unilaterally.

Chairman Lardner acknowledged the calls and letters received on the tenure issue and emphasized its full consideration in the executive session. Both tenure lists passed as presented with one negative vote from Alvarez who regretted penalizing qualified faculty.

Walters reported the results of the collective bargaining election referendum held in April. Out of 1,768 eligible votes, 1,274 voted yes and 226 no with a number of challenged ballots. He said he would ask the State Office of Collective Bargaining to continue as election administrator for the representation election in the fall.

Chairman Lardner in discussing salary increase as a priority in allotting the FY77 budget announced that in the case of the faculty in the bargaining unit, distribution of salary increases would be deferred to give any agent elected the opportunity to negotiate over salaries. Walters added that the FY77 appropriations were all that could be negotiated and to give them beforehand would remove any negotiable funds.

Walters also reported that the legislature recommendation was to be 4½% for salaries, and that for CSU the bill to pay female faculty back wages had passed the House and was waiting action in the Senate.

Chairperson Pedroso criticized the decision to withhold salary increases fron the faculty and again the exclusion of the COF from the executive sessions. She claimed the Board made decisions contrary to Board guidelines in permitting tenure quotas and permitting the lack of a doctorate to be a reason for denying tenure. She assured the Board that the protest on these items would continue.

June 17, 1976

On collective bargaining Walters reported that the Office of Collective Bargaining had agreed to conduct the representation election in the fall. He specified that that office, not the Board, would certify agents based on proper petition, with one of the choices on the ballot to be "No agent."

COF Chairperson Pedroso complained of the Board's emphasis on the need to raise tuition based on funding salary increases for faculty.

Proceedings for Fiscal Year 1977

The chronological history ends in Fiscal Year 1977 as the union's long wait finally results in victory in the October election. Little mention is made of collective bargaining in the meetings preceding the election as the result seems to be a foregone conclusion.

July 29, 1976

Walters in presenting his budget proposal for FY78 to the Board called their attention to the marked slow-down in enrollment growth at all the schools. Even with Governors State included, which had only four years of existence, he pointed that although enrollment overall in ten years had increased 132%, in five years it was up just 20%. He showed comparisons for the four BOG schools excluding GSU, on a full-time equivalent enrollment basis: Western, in ten years a 132% increase but in the last five only 7%; Eastern, 66% and 3.4%; Northeastern, 177% and 6.8%; Chicago State, 88% and 6.8%.

Also as part of the budget presentation, he compared the Consumer

Price Index, which had risen 50% in five years, with faculty salaries in Illinois universities, which had risen only 25%. He added that non-personnel costs due to inflation had risen 61% in that period but funding for them only 20%.

Chairman Lardner acknowledged the COF's request for reconsideration of the deferral of salary of faculty announced in June, but he said that since no Board member had moved for reconsideration of the item, the matter was settled.

September 16, 1976

The dates for the representation election were announced as set for October 20 and 21 on all five campuses.

Legal Officer Dunn reported that the Equal Pay Suit of the female faculty at CSU had been settled with a special appropriation of $124,991 and a check had been issued.

October 21, 1976

Only one mention was made of collective bargaining at this meeting held on the second day in which the faculty was voting, and that mention by Walters would indicate that the results were already conceded. He said that he and the presidents were preparing for system-wide collective bargaining as soon after the election as appropriate.

November 30, 1976

And he was correct because the results of the election which had required a majority of all eligible to vote, rather than either a majority of those voting or a plurality, clearly elected the American Federation of Teachers the faculty agent for the five BOG schools.

Interesting from the standpoint of using these minutes for historical purposes is the fact that no reference is made in the minutes of the November meeting, the one following the faculty vote, to the outcome of the election. A reader would know that the faculty elected the AFT as its agent only from a mention by Walters on the 19th page of the 26 pages of minutes. He stated that the Board representatives had held the initial negotiation session with the AFT on November 24 in Springfield and that it had been productive in setting up ground rules. He then named the Board's bargaining team.

The actual results were reported in a news release dated October 25, 1976 released by the Board of Governors office in Springfield. Out of some 1,743 eligible academic employees on the five campuses, 1,625 voted or 93.2% of those eligible to vote. Individual campus totals were not provided.

The vote: 1,068 votes for the AFT Faculty Federation; 464 votes for the American Association of University Professors; 93 votes for Neither. The AFT was clearly the winner with a total vote more than a majority of those eligible.

So ended the struggle which had begun over ten years before. The AFT and the CSU faculty, rebuffed in the early years, at last did bring collective bargaining to the campus of Chicago State, and in doing so, perhaps by their persistence, to the campuses of all five Board of Governors universities.

AN ANCILLARY STUDY TO THE CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY

The Reports of the Legal Officer

The role of the CSU faculty in the struggle for collective bargaining obviously became less pivotal in the final years; nevertheless, a brief analysis of solely one segment of the Board reports, The Report of the Legal Officer, can bring that role back in focus. These Reports, which are referred to sporadically in the Board proceedings, are included in the files of the Board reports on each campus.

From a study of them it would appear that suits by the CSU faculty over the years helped the AFT union demonstrate a position of faculty advocacy which must have helped eventually gain support for the union throughout the system.

For example, during the eight year period from 1964 until 1972, the Legal Officer made reference only twice to faculty suits in which CSU faculty was not involved. One was a mention of the settlement of a suit by an Illinois State University faculty member, just for information as ISU was no longer governed by the Board. The other was just one mention of a suit filed by a Northeastern faculty member against his peer faculty for their personnel report, in which the Board was not a defendant. Every other suit mentioned by the Legal Officer in his report every few months to the Board related to CSU faculty, and all were suits against the Board.

Six different cases were involved, perhaps not many against current practice in higher education but a phenomenon for the Board of Governors. In all,the Legal Officer made 37 references to CSU suits during the eight year period from 1964 to 1972.

The first mention concerned Professor Dorothy Dierickx, who with her own attorney, filed her claim to maternity benefits in April 1967. This

was reported settled for the plaintiff in June 1967 after a revision in the Board's maternity policy.

The second, the first litigation in which the AFT joined as a plaintiff, addressed the case of the non-appointment of Staughton Lynd, which was covered extensively in the minutes. This was referred to in the October 1967 minutes and was reported by the Legal Officer as settled for the plaintiff in January 1968. It brought a policy change in the Board's role in hiring, giving the Board the final decision.

A third suit was on behalf of Professor Cary Lewis who sued in September 1968 on the basis of racial discrimination with the judgment for the Board reported in May 1969. However, further action by Lewis concerning promotion and salary is reported in the Legal Report in October 1974 and June 1976.

The AFT was again the co-plaintiff in the broadest suit of all against the Board, first noted in October 1968. This suit was filed on behalf of 42 members of the faculty of CSU and Northeastern for backpay withheld from them for the strike period of April 1968. References regularly were made by the Legal Officer to that suit through July 1972, although no indication is ever made that it was settled for either party.

Then in May 1969 the AFT joined in a suit on behalf of Solomon and Lalor, two CSU faculty who had not been retained. References were made to this litigation until July 1972 when it was dismissed.

And finally a similar suit was filed in June 1970, also with AFT as co-plaintiff, for two non-retained CSU faculty, Paull and Nedelsky. The Legal Officer referred in his report to this case until April 1974 when it too was reported terminated in the Board's favor.

Then during 1972 and 1973, references were finally made to a non-CSU faculty suit. This was a non-retention case at Eastern with, significantly, the AFT local at Eastern as the co-plaintiff.

From 1974 on the faculty from other institutions began filing claims either in court or more frequently with the Fair Employment Practices Commission. The prominence of CSU faculty in the Legal Officer's Reports was less noticeable.

However, during the entire period of the study, the Legal Officer made 90 references to legal matters concerning faculty. Of those, fifty concerned CSU faculty. Of the balance, twenty concerned Eastern faculty legal matters, twelve for Northeastern faculty, eight for Western, and none at all for Governors State faculty.

In short, CSU faculty with 15% of the total BOG faculty were the subject of 55% of the Legal Officer's references to faculty suits, and in most of them the AFT was referred to as the co-plaintiff.

## CONCLUSION

The intention of this practicum was to present an objective record of the processes which led to faculty collective bargaining at Chicago State, a record based primarily on the official minutes or Proceedings of the University's governing board. From these proceedings, as presented in chronological fashion, CSU's route to faculty collective bargaining is clear.

Certainly Carr and Van Eyck's comment that "collective bargaining has taken higher education by surprise" (1973, p. 1) does not apply to CSU and its Board. The issue was either alive or merely dormant for over ten years. Collective bargaining was a long time coming to CSU, but the route though slow was indeed sure.

In fact, one could conclude that the persistence of CSU's faculty was a major factor in bringing collective bargaining to the entire BOG system and therefore to the universities of the State of Illinois, despite CSU's faculty comprising in number fewer than one-sixth of the entire BOG faculty. The continued association of CSU's faculty with the AFT union when the union issue was not active undoubtedly helped sustain an essential awareness of AFT across all faculties.

After AFT's first attempt in April 1968 to bargain for just the two Chicago schools failed, the waiting process began. Wisely the union maintained an active adversarial role with the Board by participating as a co-plaintiff in almost every faculty suit against the Board. The union also probably provided the financial backing for those suits.

As the analysis of the Reports of the Legal Officer confirms, AFT participation would have been impossible without CSU faculty participation.

For eight years CSU faculty suits dominated the attention of the legal officer of the Board, with the union usually the co-plaintiff.

If the State of Illinois had not assumed governance of Chicago Teachers College in 1965, the CTC faculty probably would have soon followed the city community colleges into collective bargaining. If the Chicago campuses had remained with the city, the faculties of the two downstate universities likely would not today be into collective bargaining as are not their former sister schools, Northern Illinois and Illinois State Universities. And if they were into bargaining, their agent would probably be AAUP rather than AFT.

CSU's faculty held a strong pro-collective bargaining posture over the years. Governance problems at CSU may not have been the primary cause of this stance, although they must have been a factor. As was evidenced many times in the Board minutes, CSU faculty seemed to have an ongoing adversarial relationship with the CSU administration. Rarely do the minutes show faculty from the other institutions bringing their problems on campus to the Board.

In both of the early votes on collective bargaining CSU faculty were by far the most supportive on the issue. In November 1973, 95% of the CSU faculty voted with 73% voting affirmatively; only 74% of the total BOG faculty voted with just 60% voting in favor. Again in November 1974 on the same issue, 89% of all eligible CSU faculty voted affirmatively as compared to 67% of all eligible BOG faculty.

Because CSU's faculty numbers were relatively small, their contribution came from keeping the campus governance issue alive. Finally, as the salary issue gained priority attention, Western's faculty began to make

collective bargaining noises. Western with over one-third of the faculty in the BOG system could not be ignored.

Originally, Western's faculty showed no interest in associating with the Chicago schools in a union. Their interest was clearly in a distinct one-instituion collective bargaining agreement, and in the early years at least, the agent would apparently have been the AAUP. Without a study of the situation at Western from sources other than the Board minutes, the cause of increased interest in collective bargaining at Western and the eventual shift of allegiance to the AFT can only be speculated upon.

Because Western's faculty, unlike CSU's, did not bring problems to the Board, one cannot decide whether the salary issue alone or salary and governance problems stimulated the collective bargaining interest at Weste rn. However, the fact that the AAUP spokesmen still held out for enabling legislation before bargaining must have helped the shift to the AFT. Because the Board chose to count the ballots in the October 1976 agent election as one unit rather than by institutions, the location of the 30% pro-AAUP vote cannot be determined. One can be fairly certain that it was not at CSU inasmuch as CSU, unlike the other four schools, has no local AAUP chapter.

Whether governance was a factor in Western's faculty dissatisfaction is not too important because without the cost of living issue, collective bargaining may have lain dormant for many more years. But the salary needs finally forced the Council of Faculties into what could be construed as a union stance. Eventually they ignored merit and, more like a union, insisted on 100% across-the-board salary increases. They set the stage for the logical next step: collective bargaining.

Beyond the issues, the political makeup of the Board may have been a factor in the final Board vote, although whether to the extent the Tribune presented in its account is debatable. If a Board member's political affiliation can be assumed to be that of the governor who appointed him, then seven were Democrats and two Republicans. The November 1975 vote, however, was only 5- 4 in favor of collective bargaining. Time on the Board might just as easily be construed as the determining element in each Board member's vote. Those with longest service, with one exception, voted Nay. Members with the shortest service voted Aye.

Of the Nay votes, Ladd (Rep.) and Lardner (Rep.) had been Board members since July 1971; Cicero (Dem.) and Davis (Dem.) since July 1973. Of the Aye votes, Relph (Dem.) also had joined in July 1973 with Cicero and Davis. But Bufalino was appointed September 1974; Kaufman, April 1975; Fey, May 1975; Alvarez, the day before the vote on November 19, 1975. The last four were appointed by the Democratic governor.

Certain other circumstances, to which no political relationship is given in the minutes, may well have speeded up the process. Perhaps if Davis rather than Relph had been on the Board's final collective bargaining committee, as Ladd seemed to have intended, the committee recommendation may have been different, and a different committee recommendation no doubt would have delayed the final approval. Similarly, if Berlanga had not been replaced by Alvarez before the vote and the Tribune interview is accurate, the vote on November 20, 1975 would definitely have been different.

Nevertheless, no matter who was appointed to the committees or the Board, the eventual outcome seemed unavoidable. Faculty preoccupation with cost of living, the overwhelming pro-collective bargaining sentiment on the

campuses, and the adversarial Board-faculty relationship would seem to make a favorable decision inevitable.

Moreover, even if the issue of collective bargaining had waned, the characteristics of the BOG schools, and in particular of CSU, indicate that the issue would eventually have come to the forefront. Boyd as early as 1971 was forecasting that ex-teachers colleges would be where the greatest interest in faculty unionism could be expected. His basis was their faculty's "inferiority complex" from their "marginal status in academic life" (1971, p. 15). CSU and three of the other four BOG schools are ex-teachers colleges. The minutes several times reflect the faculties' resentment of the secondary role in state higher education that the Board of Higher Education's Master Plan gives them.

Similarly, Tyler (1972) noted the openness to unionism in ex-teachers colleges, which he credited to their close identity with elementary, secondary, and junior college faculty, most of whom are unionized. Many of the Chicago Teachers College faculty, particularly in the early years of dealing with the Board, had K-12 experience themselves. However, by the time the final vote was taken, the background of the CSU faculty overall resembled that of a university rather than a teachers college.

Furthermore, the many rapid changes at CSU fit a pattern likely to make unionism attractive to faculty. Carr and Van Eyck in describing situations at four state colleges which moved into collective bargaining, Southern Massachusetts, Boston State, Central Michigan, and Oakland (Michigan), could have been speaking also of CSU:

> All had experienced a fundamental change in character and purpose, accompanied by a sharp increase in the size of the

> faculty, the creation of new academic programs and departments, the appointment of a new president . . . and the appearance of tensions between old and new faculty and between part of the faculty and the president (1973, p. 58).

Student reaction at the BOG schools was also typical. Although the Board had a Council of Students for many years, and in recent years student members of the Board, student involvment on the collective bargaining issue, as well as on most issues, was minimal, offered only on request. For example, CSU's student representative, who was the appointed student member of the Board's collective bargaining committee, attended none of the committee's sessions.

This apathy apparently is not unusual. Hedgepeth (1974) noted the student's lack of awareness of the impact of faculty unionism in his study of the SUNY-Cortland process. Boyd (1971) also commented on state college students' acceptance of faculty unions because typically on such campuses many of the students' parents are union members themselves.

At least initially, the issues to be addressed in the BOG negotiations will differ somewhat from the national trend. Means and Semas (1976) categorize the major collective bargaining issues as salary and tenure and governance. Based on their studies, Kemmerer and Baldridge (1975) give wages, benefits, and job security top rank with governance close behind. In the BOG minutes, although tenure and governance were certainly sources of conflict, it was salary which became the prime mover for the BOG faculties.

By the Board-established rules, negotiations between Board and union are limited to salary, benefits, and grievance procedure. Governance,

tenure, and job security are not overt issues although they all could relate to grievance procedures. In Massachusetts, from whence came the new Board executive officer Walters, governance, not salary, was the negotiable issue. With the BOG, the opposite is true.

Nevertheless, the study of the minutes over the years would seem to reveal that the faculty and the Board have been bargaining over governance. Many references are made to compromises on policies among the COF, the presidents, and the Board. As a result, the faculty gradually gained a substantial voice in the Board governance.

Comments in the minutes acknowledged the faculty's unusual strength. The COF Chairman Marshall admitted that the Council of Faculties was "one of the first in the U.S." (Proceedings, FY1974, p. 87). GSU president Engbretsen also referred to the creation of the COF as a sign of the Board's "national leadership" ( FY1976, p. 128). As far back as 1972, the retiring chairman of the COF expressed his gratitude for the fact that "many policies recommended by the COF had been adopted" (FY 1973, p. 20).

An example of the extent to which BOG faculty had been bargaining with the Board can come from a comparison of the CSU situation with that of women faculty at Oakland University, as described by Kemerer and Baldridge (1975). At Oakland among the issues resolved through union collective bargaining were adjusting salary inequities for women, gaining faculty status for librarians (mostly women), and securing paid maternity leaves. At CSU all those issues were resolved to the faculty's liking without a union.

Overall, in many ways, CSU'S movement into collective bargaining was rather typical. In other ways, it was unique. The underlying causes of

faculty collective bargaining are similar from institution to institution. What takes place at one school can be a guide, or a warning, to others.

However, the process by which collective bargaining came to CSU in itself was very unusual. The time involved, a process taking over ten years, was remarkable. Both the beginning of the process and its ending may well have been truly unique.

The strike in April 1968 was probably the first in the country over faculty collective bargaining at a four-year institution of higher education. Carr and Van Eyck (1973) call September 1969 the starting point for faculty bargaining at four-year institutions, referring to the agreement at City University of New York. They refer to two other contracts at special-purpose institutions, one at the Merchant Marine Academy signed in February 1968 and one at the Bryant College of Business Administration in 1967. In the Board proceedings of January 1968 McKelvey, the Board executive officer, mentioned that only the Merchant Marine Academy of all four-year institutions had a collective bargaining contract. And Tempo in its summary article of May 15, 1968 on the strike referred again to the Academy's singular status.

The outcome, in which CSU was a key factor, also marks a first. Nowhere else has a governing system in higher education voluntarily gone into collective bargaining while setting its own rules and not relying on enabling legislation.

In summary then, what might be the value of this practicum? For CSU itself? And beyond the campus of CSU?

The study was made primarily for its value to CSU's chief admin-

istrators. As was its aim, the completed study will give them an historic perspective and a better understanding of those processes which brought them to this unique situation in collective bargaining. From that understanding should come greater insight in dealing with this new issue and, equally as important, in dealing with the CSU faculty generally.

Another value to the study might be as a warning to any other student who plans to base his research on the proceedings or minutes of this Board or any board. For many of the more significant items in the chronology, outside sources were imperative and fortunately could be found. The recording secretary of any board has the power to determine what is relevant and, as frequently was demonstrated in this study, he may give light coverage to major facts while highlighting records of conversations, for example.

The extent to which the study may have value beyond the CSU campus remains to be seen and was only of secondary importance in proposing the practicum. Much will depend on whether the Board and the AFT have reasonably successful negotiations using the Board rules and no legislation. As a first, this approach, if successful, may spread to other systems and its evolution may be of interest to students and writers on collective bargaining in higher education.

If so, an objective analysis of the process should be helpful. Although this study purposely focused on CSU, CSU's role in the process of reaching system-wide collective bargaining was very significant and might be called pivotal.

The original intention of the practicum was to follow the lead of Carr and Van Eyck, who in their book intended to bring "an orderly

and dispassionate account of what has been happening regarding collective bargaining on campuses" (1973, p. ix), and present such an orderly and dispassionate account of the coming of collective bargaining to CSU. In successfully doing that, it would appear that a somewhat orderly, dispassionate, and perhaps valuable account of the coming of collective bargaining to the Board of Governors has also evolved. The bonus benefit, although unscheduled, is no less welcome.

REFERENCES

Alexander, B. H. Personal communication, February 22, 1977.

American Psychological Association. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author, 1974.

Banas, C. College Unit Rejects Viet Foe. Chicago Tribune, July 18, 1967, p. 5.

Blocker, C. E. , Bender, L. W., & Martorama, S. V. The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1975.

A blow to higher education. Editorial. Chicago Tribune, November 23, 1975, Sect.II, p. 4.

Boyd, W. E. Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences. In C.R. Hughes & R. L. Underbrink & C. O. Gordon (Eds.), Collective Negotiations in Higher Education. Carlinville, Ill. : Blackburn College Press, 1973.

Carr, R. K. & Van Eyck, D. K. Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

College Board Chief Raps Faculty Union. Chicago Tribune, April 12, 1967, Sect. 1A, p. 4.

Council of Faculties Minutes. Referred to as COF Minutes. Total collection housed in Eastern Illinois University Library, Charleston, Ill. (Mimeographed.) 1969-1977.

CSC faculty members on strike. Tempo, April 11, 1968, p. 1.

CSC faculty strikes out; Nelson questions results. Tempo, May 15, 1968, p. 1.

Elbert, A. J. Personal communication, February 28, 1977.

Election denial causes teachers to call strike vote. Tempo, January 24, 1968, p. 1.

Faculty fights for changes. Tempo, November 30, 1967, p. 1.

Faculty Unionization. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1977, 13 (20), 6.

Faculty will strike if request denied again. Tempo, February 7, 1968, p. 1.

Hedgepeth, R. C. Consequences of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 15 (9), 691-705.

Kearney, E. W. Chicago State College 1869-1969. A Centennial Retrospective. Chicago: Chicago State College, 1969.

Kemerer, F. R. & Baldridge, J. V. Unions On Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Ladd, E. C. ,Jr. & Lipset, S. M. The Ladd-Lipset Survey: The Growth of Faculty Unions. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1976, 12 (20), 11.

Lauerman, C. Politics charged in ouster from state board. Chicago Tribune. November 24, 1975, Sec. I, p. 5.

Means, H. B. & Semas, P. W. (Eds.) A Chronicle of Higher Education Handbook: Faculty Collective Bargaining. Washington, D. C.: Editorial Projects for Education, 1976.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Four sets: July 31, 1976; September 16,1976; October 21, 1976; and November 30, 1976. (Mimeographed.) Springfield,Ill. : Board of Governors, in press.

Moses, S. Collective Bargaining Agreements in Higher Education. Columbia: Department of Higher and Adult Education, University of Missouri, 1974.

Negronida, P. Teachers Strike 2 State Colleges. Chicago Tribune, April 4, 1968, Sect. 1, p. 20.

News Release--Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. (Mimeographed.) Springfield: Board of Governors, October 25, 1976.

O.K. Lynd for College. Chicago Tribune, October 20, 1967, pp. 1 ; 4.

Proceedings of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois (11 vol.). Springfield: State of Illinois, 1965-66 through 1975-76.

Proceedings of the Teachers College Board of the State of Illinois: July 1, 1964 - June 30, 1965. Springfield: State of Illinois, 1965.

Rejects Demands of Union. Chicago Tribune, April 19, 1968, Sect. 1, p. 14.

Report of the Legal Officer to the Board of Governors. Reports No. 1 - 83. (Mimeographed.) Springfield: Board of Governors, 1964 - 1976.

Semas, P. W. Faculty Unions Add 60 Campuses in 1975-76 Academic Year. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1976, 12 (14), 5.

Stanton, L. P. Profile of the University. (Mimeographed.) Chicago: Chicago State University Office of University Relations, 1976.

Subversion by the Governor. Editorial. Chicago Tribune, November 26, 1975, Sec. II, p. 2.

Teachers Vote to Strike Two City Colleges. Chicago Tribune, April 3, 1968, Sec. Ic, p. 4.

Trow, M. Aspects of American Higher Education 1969-1975. Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1977.

Tyler, G. The Faculty Joins the Proletariat. In C.R. Hughes & R. L. Underbrink & C. O. Gordon (Eds.) Collective Negotiations in Higher Education. Carlinville, Ill.: Blackburn College Press, 1973.